THE CHURCHMAN.

THE CHURCH OF THE LIVING GOD, THE PILLAR AND G UND OF THE TRUTH.—1 Tim. iii. 15.

Vol. VIII. No. 51. | NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, MACH 2, 1839. | Whole Number 415

POETRY.

From the Church.

OUR ALTARS.

The altars of the forest land!
Oh bless'd and beautiful they rise—
Bright homes upon a foreign strand,
To greet the wandering Briton's eyes.
A thousand dreams of pleasant thought
Float o'er the heart in startling truth,
As fancy paints each well-known spot
Like these, the worshipped shrine of youth;
Where early faith's first voice was heard,
Where childhood lisp'd each holiest word!

The altars of the forest land!
Amid the dark wood's sylvan shade,
Like happy spots of peace they stand,
For rest for weary pilgrims made.
No splendor clothes each humble dome,
No fretted roof or sculptured shrine—
But faith and hope find there a home,
And Christians feel the place divine.
Bright gifts have lain as offerings there,
The treasur'd thoughts of heavenward pray'r!

The altars of the forest land!
Fair scions of the parent tree,
Beneath whose far-spread shade we stand,
Amid the blessings of the free.
Here may the wandering Briton come,
Here may he breath his lowly vow;
He clasps the altar of his home
His father's God is near him now!
In the dark waste a fountain springs—
The wearied dove may fold its wings.

The altars of the forest land!
Long be the dear-priz'd birthright ours—
Beneath their fostering shade to stand,
And call them freedom's guardian powers!
And 'mid the holiest things of earth,
First of the gifts we deem divine,
Be ours—the freeman's sacred hearth,
Be ours—the Christian's stainless shrine!
No brighter boon for man may be
Than these—the treasures of the free!

THE CODE OF CANONS OF THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN SCOTLAND.

APPENDIX.

(*Continued from page* 197.)

No 1.—*Deed of Election of the Primus.*

We the bishops, (*or the majority of the bishops,*) of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, being assembled, under the protection of the Almighty, at , for the purpose of electing one of our number to fill the office of PRIMUS of our Episcopal College in the room of our Right Rev. brother, , bishop of , the late primus, in conformity with the second canon of this Church, do hereby nominate and elect our Rt. Rev. brother bishop of , to be the primus, with the privileges attached to that office, under the restrictions imposed by the said canon; and we pray that our said Right Rev. brother may be enabled to perform the duties of the office, by our election now duly committed to him, to the glory of God, and the good of his Church. In witness whereof we do hereby subscribe these presents at on this day of in the year of our Lord

No. 2.—*Form of a Mandate for the Election of a Bishop.*

Whereas it hath pleased Almighty God, in his infinite wisdom and goodness, to take unto himself the soul of our dear brother, the Right Rev. N., your late ordinary and diocesan, and thereby to deprive the Church in Scotland of an able and upright governor, and you of a vigilant pastor and overseer, WE, the primus, in our own name, and with the sanction of our colleagues, the surviving bishops and pastors of the said Church, on whom the government of the Diocese of M. hath in the meantime devolved, do hereby authorize and command you, the presbyters of the said diocese, to repair within the space of thirty days from the date hereof, to such a place within the diocese as shall be most convenient for yourselves, and then and there, between the hours of eight in the morning and four in the afternoon, to elect for your bishop and pastor a man of blameless conduct, orthodox in the faith, apt to teach, fit to govern, and having a good report as well of those who are without as of those within the pale of the Church.

In the meantime we exhort you, individually and collectively, to consider well the sacred nature of the trust which we now commit to you, and the importance of the election which you are to make; and having the fear of God and the peace of the Church perpetually in your view, to divest yourselves of all partiality and prejudice arising from personal attachment or enmity to any individual, remembering that your choice will necessarily affect the interests, not of the Diocese of M. only, but also of the whole Church in Scotland. *Episcopatus unus est, cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur*, is a proposition venerable, not merely for its antiquity and its author, but because on its truth rests the possibility of exercising any discipline in the Church Catholic.

You are to have in view, therefore, not only the peace and good government of the Diocese of M., with which you are most intimately connected, but likewise the peace and harmony and good government of the whole Church of God which is in Scotland, under the government of the College of Bishops. It is for securing the former of these objects that, when a diocese becomes vacant, the presbyters of the said diocese have the privilege of making the first choice, and presenting the person elected to the bishops for consecration; and it is for securing the latter, which is at least of equal importance, that the bishops reserve to themselves the right of confirming or setting aside the election of the presbyters.

While we have no wish to encroach on your rights, we must in duty maintain our own; and therefore we earnestly entreat you to make choice of some godly and well-learned man, whose dispositions are reasonably believed to be such as will induce him to co-operate with his colleagues in all things proper, and whose humility there is reason to hope will, through divine grace, keep him from aspiring to a superiority over any of them, and from falling into that condemnation which the apostle so much dreads in every novice.

Earnestly praying God to direct you by his Holy Spirit in all things, and in the discharge of this most important duty in particular, we are, &c.

No. 3.—*Declaration to be Signed by the Presbyters at the Election of a Bishop.*

At , this day of in the year of our Lord , We, the presbyters of the Diocese of having, (day and date as above specified,) in obedience to the mandate of the Right Rev. the Primus and comprovincial bishops of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, met together at for the purpose of electing a bishop to superintend the diocese now vacant by the demise (*or translation*) of the Right Rev. , the late ordinary, did make choice of, and elect to that sacred office , whom we now humbly and respectfully present to the primus and his venerable colleagues for consecration (*or collation*) as our future diocesan; at the same time solemnly declaring that each individual elector hath, for himself, most conscientiously exercised his best judgment for the ultimate good, increase and prosperity of the Church.

No. 4.—*Form of Letters Testimonial for Holy Orders to be subscribed by two or more Episcopal Clergymen.*

Whereas our well-beloved in Christ, hath declared to us his intention of offering himself a candidate for the sacred office of a deacon, (*or priest,*) and for that end hath requested of us letters testimonial of his learning and good behaviour; we, therefore, whose names are hereunto subscribed, do testify that the said having been personally known to us for the space of three years last past, hath, during that time, lived piously, soberly, and honestly, and diligently applied himself to his studies; nor has he at any time (as far as we know or have heard) maintained or written any thing contrary to the doctrine or discipline of the Episcopal Church in Scotland. And moreover, we think him a person worthy to be admitted to the sacred order of deacons, (*or* .) In witness whereof, we have, &c.

To be addressed to the Bishop by whom the candidate is to be ordained.

No. 5.—*Form of Si Quis, to be read from the Desk after Morning Prayers, on some Sunday at least two weeks before the day appointed for the Ordination.*

Whereas N. B., a member of this congregation, hath applied to A. B., Bishop of N., to be admitted into deacons' orders, and the bishop hath appointed day of for that purpose; this is to give notice, that if you, or any of you, know any just cause why the said N. B. should not be ordained, you are hereby requested and required to declare the same to me, within a week from this date, or to the bishop aforesaid at his residence, one week at least before the day fixed for the ordination.

Form of Certificate that the Si Quis has been read.

We do hereby certify that the above notice was publicly read by the undersigned C. D., in the chapel of , in the county of during divine service, on Sunday, the day of , and that no impediment was offered.

Witness our hands, C. D., *Minister.*
B. F., *Vestryman.*

(*To be continued.*)

From a Visitation Sermon of the Rev. Dr. Hook.

A CALL TO UNION ON THE PRINCIPLES OF THE ENGLISH REFORMATION.

Sirs, ye are brethren; why do ye wrong one. to another? Acts vii. 26.

Concluded from page 197.

Come we now to the doctrine of the Apostolical Succession. On this subject no controversy existed at the time of the Reformation. It was, at that time, as it had been for 1500 years, taken for granted, that no man might presume to minister in sacred things, unless he were first appointed to the office by persons having authority to make the appointment by their regular succession from the apostles. Upon this point no one is more eloquent or more decided than our own reforming Archbishop, Dr. Cranmer. Accordingly, when in the reign of Elizabeth the Thirty-nine Artic es were agreed upon in a convocation of our clergy, the doctrine was assumed: "It is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of public preaching or administering the sacraments in the congregation before he be lawfully called and sent to execute the same. And those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them *in*"—not *by*, but *in*—"the congregation to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard." (Article xxiii.) But the point being settled that there *are* some persons *in* the congregation or Church who have powers to ordain, the question is who those persons are? This was the question in debate at the Reformation, and it is easily answered so far as the Church of England is concerned, since it was settled, before the Thirty-nine Articles were received, in the ordinal, in which it is affirmed: "It is evident to all men diligently *reading the Scriptures and ancient authors*, that from the apostles' time there have been these three orders of ministers in Christ's Church, bishops, priests, and deacons." (Pref. to the Ordinal.) In the order for consecrating bishops, as well as in the Ordination Service, she speaks of the offices of priests and deacons as offices *divinely* instituted; and, if instituted by God, of course they cannot be lawfully abolished. But it is a point not controverted, that wherever these officers exist, the power of ordination rests with the first, assisted by the second. And accordingly, in legislating on this subject, the Church of England ordains that "no one shall be accounted and taken to be a lawful bishop, priest, or deacon, among us, or be suffered to execute any of the ministerial functions, except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted thereunto, according to our form of Episcopal ordination, *or hath had formerly Episcopal consecration or ordination*." (Pref. to Ordinal.) A more complete answer to the question, who are they that have authority in the congregation, could not be given by a Church which reverences Scripture *and the ancient authors*. And hence it is, that while a minister of the Roman Church officiates among us, upon the renunciation of his errors, without a further ordination, a converted Presbyterian minister is unable to do so. The one has had, the other has not had, Episcopal ordination.

Now this regulation very naturally offends the various self-appointed ministers and teachers who have, of late years, abounded in the land. They accuse the Church of intolerance, bigotry, and illiberality, since they conclude that she implies, by this regulation, the invalidity of all but Episcopal ordination; and in this conclusion they are the rather confirmed when they find our canons denouncing, as *ipso facto* excommunicated, not only those who affirm that the Church of England is not a true and apostolical Church, (Can. ii.) or that the form of God's worship in the Church of England is corrupt, (Can. iv.) but also those who, not being of the Church of England, challenge to themselves in England the name of true and lawful Churches, (Can. xi.) Under such a reproach some of the members of our Church are impatient, and deny that the conclusion must of necessity be drawn. Others, rejoicing in every thing to bear the scandal of the cross, admit the justness of the conclusion, but contend that the Church is no more to be blamed for this than a mirror for the wrinkles or deformities it may bring to view. The Church injures no one by asserting the fact, for, if it *be* a fact, a fact it is whether she asserts it or not. It either is a fact that a society of believers, organized without the Episcopal order, is not a Church, but merely a sect not organized according to apostolical and scriptural rule, as our Church insinuates, or it is not a fact. It is open to discussion whether it be a fact; there is no want of charity in our declaring what we believe to be such. As maintainers of God's truth we are to declare it in this as in every other instance, and in God's good time the truth will be known and recognised, and those who have deserted it will perceive that Christian unity is to be restored, not by *our* yielding to *them*, but by *their* returning to *us*. As we may preach that faith in the Lord Jesus is necessary to salvation, without denying the salvability of the heathen; so none will refuse to admire and reverence and love the pious and consistent Christian of every communion, whether Romish or Protestant; none—God forbid,—will doubt of his being capable of salvation, though we may still believe that in many respects he may have fallen short of gospel truth. But be this as it may—it is a principle to be discussed with those who are in principle separated from us, it is certainly no just cause of angry dispute among ourselves, who have declared our unfeigned assent and consent not only to our articles, but to our ordination offices, the first of which declare that those only may minister in sacred things who are duly ordained, and the second that those only are to be considered by us as duly ordained who have received Episcopal orders. The only legitimate subject of discussion among *us* is, how are we to meet the objection to our principle as urged by Dissenters; a mere matter of opinion, not a fair plea for division.

I will only advert to one point more, and then hasten to a conclusion. I allude now to the angry debates which contentious men would raise among us with reference to the ceremonies of the Church. On this subject, too, we are in principle united. We all agree that forms and ceremonies are in themselves things indifferent, unless they have been divinely prescribed, as in the case of the sacraments, and some of the sacramentals. We are all of us also agreed in admitting that when we have solemnly vowed as bishops, priests, and deacons of the Church of England to adhere to the forms and ceremonies, rubrics, usages, and regulations of the Church of England, these ceremonies, relatively to us, cease to be things indifferent. If we make a vow, we are, of course bound to keep it, and they, therefore, if such there be, who think that they show their wisdom by a studied disregard of the decent ceremonies of the Church, do, in reality, only show the little respect they have for their declarations and oaths. But it is notorious, from whatever circumstances, that, since the Reformation, the ceremonies of the Church of England have been, in several respects, altered, either by the introduction of new practices, or by the neglect of old ones. For example, we find that metrical psalms are now sung as a regular part of our service, of which they originally formed no portion. This innovation is one of ancient date, and I am not complaining of it, but still it *is* an innovation, and like most innovations, it has gradually led to another of a very questionable character; I allude to the introduction of unauthorized hymns of human composition. Another innovation since the time of our reformers is the use of extempore prayer before or after the sermon. Now these are very serious innovations, since they afford to an individual minister more liberty than the Church allows, and enable him to blend his private opinions with the acknowledged principles of the Church in such a manner as to confound the one with the other. Many other innovations of minor importance might easily be pointed out, such as the prevailing practice for the minister to turn in prayer *to* the people: in the days of the reformers, and for some time after, the minister turned *from* the people in prayer, *to* them in exhortation, so that even by his action the people could distinguish between his address *to* them, and his address *for* them and *with* them to God:—they were continually reminded, by outward circumstances, of the holy duty in which they ought to be engaged. The innovation in this respect has likewise led to another, in that unsightly novelty a second pulpit, which is now adopted in some sanctuaries, instead of the ancient fald-stool or low desk. Among omissions, we may note that the people (in consequence, perhaps, of the former innovation,) too generally sit instead of kneel at prayer, and seldom bow, at the name of the Lord Jesus; while in some places we find that the clergy no longer say the Communion Service standing at the communion table, and the table is deprived of the candlesticks with which it is directed that it should be adorned. Anthems are frequently discontinued, even in places where they sing; except when there is a communion the offertory and prayer for the Church militant are generally omitted, and several portions of the clerical habiliments have fallen into disuse.

There are more serious omissions to which I will not now refer; such as the omission of the daily prayers, though every clergyman is directed to have them solemnized in his church; such as the neglect of weekly communions; such as the omission, when the eucharist itself is administered, on the part of some of the clergy, to place the bread and wine, with their own hands, as an oblation on the altar, although at the last review of the liturgy, a rubric was expressly and deliberately introduced to compel this observance; such as the neglect, on the part of others, to give that sacrament with the words addressed to each individual communicant; for these are omissions of too serious a nature to come under the head of mere ceremonies. With respect to the other matters to which I have referred, I am perfectly ready to admit that many of them are, in themselves, of very little moment; but when we are solemnly pledged to conform to the ceremonies of the Church of Engla the tender conscience will be apt to inquir hat those ceremonies are to the observance which we are thus bound. Now some are opinion that they act sufficiently up to the ow, when they observe such ceremonies as t find handed down to them in the congreg n over which they are appointed to presi Others may be of opinion that the ceremo s ought to be observed precisely as they re originally appointed. A third party are opinion, to which I myself incline, that th act in perfect consistency with their pled if they take things as they find them, mere guarding against further innovations; and, as occasion offers, they return more near to the practice of the reformers, which the ejoice to think is the practice also of the pri ive Church. But here again the Protestant issenters are prepared to upbraid us. Ou ceremonies and our ecclesiastical habits, in great part our services themselves, a the same as those which are used by the C rch of Rome, and therefore they accuse u f being papistical for retaining them. Here en, we are again placed on the defensive, and ow are we to defend ourselves? Some person egret that so many of the old ceremonies re retained by our reformers, but defend th m on the ground that they are not actually ful, that in practice they have been much s plified, and they very properly conclude tha t is better to observe them, since they are en ined, than to commit schism. Others, on t contrary, defend us by acting again on the ffensive: they accuse the sectarians in gen al of a want of due reverence for things sacre a forgetfulness of the majesty of the Deity, w o is approached too often in terms of ecstatic amiliarity, amounting almost to profaneness they appeal to the Scriptures which, whil revealing to us the loving kindness of our od, would at the same time impress our m ds with a mysterious awe of Jehovah; and i tead, therefore, of apologizing for our observa ces, they express their satisfaction that, by the olemnity of our services and the decorum of our ceremonies, the devotions of the Church re discriminated from the ranting and rapture of most modern sects. They may at the same time reverence our particular ceremonies as t e relics of primitive devotion, and, regard, with a sentiment akin to piety, what acts as one of the connecting links between us and our forefathers.* At the same time they carry out the principle of the English reformers, and perceive how the retention of the ancient ceremonies disarms the Romanist of one of his arguments. We tell the Romanist that ours is the old Catholic Church of England—his, a new sect. And when he points to his ceremonies, as a badge of his antiquity, we can defy him to the proof, for, (more especially if our rubrics be duly observed,) we have in common with him the ancient ceremonies of the primitive Church, and where he differs from us, he almost always differs on matters subsequently introduced.

Now here is certainly room for some diversity of opinion, but surely, my brethren, there can be no room for that fierceness of controversy with which this subject is sometimes approached. For whether we estimate the value of our ceremonies too highly or too meanly, in principle we are all united:—the ceremonies of the Church of England must be observed because we are pledged to observe them, and the ceremonies of the Church of England, *on y.*

I am far from intending to say that in these differences of opinion there is nothing of importance. If we were assembled in Convocation, empowered to make further reforms in our Church, or to discuss the need of them, our opinions with respect to the value of tradition would be important in the extreme; so would be our opinions concerning the efficacy of the sacraments, and the relative value of primitive ceremonies, if we were reconstructing our baptismal and liturgical offices; nor of less importance would be our opinions on the Apostolical Succession, if the decision were to rest with us whether the Church should recognise the ministerial functions of men not episcopally ordained. But happily for us these questions have been decided for us by the Chnrch, and to the decision of the Church, by the very fact of our being Churchmen, we unanimously bow; we receive her decisions as our common principle. The principles of the Church, as we have seen, form an insurmountable barrier between us and the dissenter, both Romish and Protestant, and render union with either of those parties impossible. But to us Churchmen, surely our common principles, if we be not carnal men cherishing in our hearts bitter envying and strife, must be a common bond of union. But how can this union be preserved, unless, like the Church itself, while we are firm to our principles, we are tolerant towards the opinions of our brethren? The rule of the Church is indeed admirable. If any clergyman, either by his teaching or by his conduct, violate any principle of the Church he ought to be accused to the bishop, to receive such accusations is indeed one of the purposes for which our diocesan holds his court among us on such occasions as the present; and if, after trial, the accused be found guilty, he may be excommunicated and deposed. But the Church does not permit one preacher to pronounce a judgment, as it were *ex cathedra* on another, to anathematize his opinions when he cannot canonically prove him to be guilty of heresy, or even *officially* to attempt the refutation of them; for our 53d canon enacts, "If any preacher shall, in the pulpit, particularly or namely, of purpose, impugn or confute any doctrine delivered by any other preacher in the same church, or in any church near adjoining, before he hath acquainted the bishop of the diocese therewith, and received order from him what to do in that behalf,"—he shall be liable to suspension; a regulation this, obviously just and wise. We may descend from our official situation, and appear in the arena on equal terms as controversialists, if in opinion we unfortunately differ; but in this case, the one controversialist is not more infallible than the other, and if, *pendente lite*, one party takes upon him officially to give sentence on the other, what is this but a *petitio principii* as absurd as it is intolerant? In very truth, if each individual preacher were permitted thus to erect himself into an infallible Pope, fulminating his anathemas to the right hand and to the left, we should live for a time in a state of Ishmaelitish discord, when our hand would be against every man, and every man's hand against us, and at last we should subside into a despotism and tyranny worse than Rome ever invented, or Geneva contemplated.

Needful it is to make these observations, since, as I have hinted before, the worst part of the periodical and (so called) religious press, are by their misrepresentations inflaming the passions of weaker brethren in the ministry, and are calling upon them, under the pretence of speaking out for the truth, to violate the laws of the Church, and by turning it into the platform of angry contention thus to desecrate the pulpit. Remember, brethren, that if the propagation of evangelic truth be one portion of our duty, it is no less our duty, by the sacrifice of all personal considerations, by the humiliation of our proud, the restraint of our angry, the denial of our selfish passions, by the due control even of our better emotions, to preserve the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. Remember, brethren, that our enemies are many and mighty: the two extremes of Romanism and Ultraprotestantism are banded, together with infidelity, against us, and if, like Sampson's foxes, they are pulling different ways, the brands which are attached to them have one and the self-same object—our destruction. And is this a time to divide our house, and to form parties and factions? Is this the season for discord? Remember, brethren, the ties, the sacred ties, which bind us to one another: as men, we are all under the same condemnation, we are all heirs of the same corrupted nature, equally one and all children of wrath: as Christians, we seek for reconciliation with an offended Maker, through the atoning merits and the all-prevailing intercession of the same crucified, the same glorified Saviour, through the sanctification of the same blessed Spirit: we worship the same God, the Trinity in Unity. We are brethren of the same household, with one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of us all; ministers of Christ acting under the same apostolical commission, pledged all to walk by the same rule, and to speak the same thing; bound all by the same vows, with interests, and pursuits, and duties, and privileges identical; where, I ask again, can Christian unanimity and harmony be found if we find it not here? "*Sirs, ye are brethren,*" Oh, wrong not one another. *Sirs, ye are brethren*, and your Master is praying in heaven that ye may be one even as he is one with the Father; Oh seek not by your passions to frustrate his work! *Sirs, ye are brethren,*—as brethren let us act cordially together, and gradually our differences will lessen, our agreements will extend. Then shall we stand, a holy army closely embodied together, prepared with redoubled vigor to prosecute our warfare against the powers of darkness,—and then we shall find how sweeter than the ointment with which Aaron was anointed, how refreshing, as the dews of Hermon, it is for brethren to dwell together in unity—then the peace of God will rest upon us; that peace which the world can neither give nor take away.

* Thus our great reformer, Archbishop Parker, in his speech to the Convocation, speaks of our ceremonies: "He had for exerting himself not only the precedent of the late martyrs of the Reformation, but of saints of the earliest antiquity; that some of these in the first centuries arrived in this island, and have left us noble remains of their piety and success; and notwithstanding the instructions they left, and the usages they settled, are partly worn out by time and superstition, yet many of them have had a more happy conveyance, and reached down to the present age: and that it appears our constitutions and ceremonies are little different from what was then established."—*Collier* ii. 537.

From Bishop McIlvaine's Sermon at the consecration of the Rt. Rev. Leonidas, Polk, D. D.

THE APOSTOLIC COMMISSION.

What was the peculiar characteristic nature of the office which the apostles were commissioned to exercise?

The authentic voucher of office is the *commission*. To the commission of the apostles then we must refer you for the distinctive peculiarities of their office. Whatever is not contained therein, either expressly or by necessary inference, must be considered as not pertaining to the characteristic duties and powers of the apostles.

Now the apostles were distinguished by certain circumstantial peculiarities, and certain miraculous gifts. Were these so connected with the apostolic office, as to constitute in any sense its distinguishing features. *They are not mentioned in the commission*, as found in the text. For example, the apostles were distinguished by the fact that they had seen Christ in the flesh after his resurrection; but so had many others, "even five hundred brethren at once." 1 Cor. xv. 6. Thus were the apostles *qualified* to be "witnesses of his resurrection;" but this *qualification* was not their *commission*. It was part of their furniture; but no part of their office. Again, they had been set apart to their office *by the immediate and visible act of the Saviour*. But Matthias was afterward numbered with the apostles; and Barnabas, and Timothy, and Epaphroditus were apostles, to whom belonged no such distinction; so that eminent as was this personal honor, it was not necessary to the designation or place of an apostle. Again, the apostles were possessed of miraculous powers. But so were divers others, as Stephen and Philip, to whom the name of apostle was never given. It follows, that such endowments were not peculiar features of the apostolic office. Essential to its success in those days, they undoubtedly were; but essential to its nature they certainly were not. We must not confound *authority* to act, with the *means* of acting successfully; the *office* of an ambassador, with the force of mind, or the personal endowments with which he sustains his embassy; the *commission* of one whom the King despatches to subdue and govern a distant province, with the array of martial force with which he marches to the work. No more must the essential office of the apostles, sent to subdue, and establish, and rule, as ambassadors of Christ, be confounded with those extraordinary endowments and all that striking array of miraculous powers with which they were furnished for their enterprise. Such endowments were needed for the first propagation of the Gospel. They have not been needed since. They have therefore ceased. But the essential commission of the apostles, to which they were appended, has not ceased, nor can cease, while the world lasts; for Christ has promised that he will be with that office to the end of the world. That commission was complete as soon as delivered; and from that moment its recipients were invested with all the functions of the apostolic office. But not so with regard to miraculous gifts and qualifications. These were not bestowed till many days after the delivery of the commission. It was before the ascension of Christ that the full *authority* of apostles was bestowed. It was not till the Pentecost that they received "*power* from on high" for the support of that authority.

Thus are we brought again to the question, *What was the peculiar and characteristic nature of the apostolic office?* They themselves applied to it a name which will aid the answer. Peter, in addressing his brother apostles concerning the filling of the vacancy caused by the death of Iscariot, expressly styles the office which the traitor had vacated *his bishopric, or his episcopate*, as the original reads. The same is also called, in the same transaction, his *apostleship*. Hence, in the writings of the fathers, the names of *apostle* and *bishop* are used as pertaining essentially to the same office. But the word *bishopric* or *episcopate*, in the abstract, only means an office of *supervision* in general; and this supervision may be either of single congregations, as in the cases of "the elders" of Ephesus; or of many congregations, *with their overseers*, as in the case of Paul, who assembled and charged those elders. What then was the peculiar nature of the supervision or episcopate exercised by the apostles, that *name*, of itself, does not indicate. Whither shall we go to ascertain whether it was a particular or a general supervision, congregational or the contrary? Their commission decides, "Go and teach all nations," &c. Therefore, whatever powers their *apostleship* or *episcopate* embraced, were not limited to any particular congregation of the Church, but extended to the whole Church; in other words, the "bishopric" in the hands of the apostles was evidently *general*, as distinguished from *congregational*. What particular functions belonged to that general oversight or episcopate their commission leaves no room to doubt. First, "Go and teach all nations;" or as the more accurate and universally preferred translation is, "Go and make disciples of all nations." Thus was given authority to propagate the Gospel. "Baptizing them in the name of the Father," &c. Here was authority to administer the sacraments of the Church, and by the sacrament of baptism to open the doors of the Church, and of its privileges to disciples out of all nations. Finally, "teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." These words conveyed to the apostles the authority *to rule the Church*, after they had made disciples by preaching, and members by baptism. An essential part of the government of the Church consisted in seeing to the *succession* of its ministry. That the authority to do this, to ordain successors in the ministry, was included among the powers of the apostles, is not only necessarily implied in their authority to govern, but also in those impressive words of the Saviour, "As the Father hath sent me, even so send I you." For as it was part of the office on which Jesus was sent, to institute the ministry of his Church; so it follows from these words that it was part of the sending of the apostles to continue that ministry, by the ordaining of others to its functions.

The conclusion, then, with regard to the characteristic nature of the apostolic office is, that it was one of a *general supervision or episcopate*, and embraced essentially the authority to preach and propagate the Gospel; to administer the sacraments of the Church; to preside over its government, and as a chief part of government, to ordain helpers and successors in the ministry. All these powers the apostles held, *not as a collective body or college;* but *severally and individually*. Hitherto we have been, as far as I know, upon undisputed ground. Let us proceed.

This apostolic office was intended by the Saviour to be continued; in other words, *the first apostles were intended to have successors to the end of the world.*

This is undeniably manifest from the promise of the Saviour, annexed to their commission, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." Now, if neither the *persons* of the apostles were intended to remain to the end of the world; nor *their miraculous endowments;* nor *their distinguishing office;* if all have passed away, we are quite unable to comprehend how that promise is fulfilled, or what it could have meant. But *the persons* of the first apostles do not remain. Their *miraculous gifts* have not been continued in the Church. It follows then that *their distinguishing office* must remain; that it was to this office, and to those who should hold it in succession, that the Saviour promised his presence "to the end of the world." No other sense can possibly be put on his words. If then the office of the apostles, as learned from their commission, and interpreted by all the acts of their ministry, was an episcopate—an office of supervision, and that of a general kind—and if *each* apostle did embrace in his *individual* office the right to preach, administer the sacraments, exercise supreme jurisdiction in the Church, and under the head of jurisdiction, to ordain and rule ministers of the Gospel; it follows that an office of precisely that description was intended to continue, has continued from that time to this; and will be continued in the Church, by the will of its divine Head, to the end of the world.

But where shall we find this office in the present Church; this union of authority to preach and administer sacraments, *with this individual right to ordain, and this presidency over clergy;* this original, apostolic episcopate? Evidently, there must be somewhere in the Church at the present time, unless the Lord's word has failed, officers of whom it may be said, without arrogance and in simple deference to the promise of Christ, that in all essential features of the apostolic office, they are *the successors of the apostles.* Where are they? The question we have no right to treat as unimportant. Whether a most solemn promise of Christ has been fulfilled or not; and if it has, where its fulfilment appears; whether an office intended by the Head of the Church to continue therein, and as its chief office to last *to* the end of time, has continued to the present time; or whether it has been dropped, and some other placed in its stead, is surely a question of no ordinary importance, by no means of a merely incidental consequence; but on the contrary, of vital connection with the permanent interests of religion, and not by any to be passed over "unadvisedly or lightly," but considered "reverently, discreetly, soberly, and in the fear of God."

But before I further put this question, it is well to remove the idea which so commonly starts up in the minds of those who hear or read on this subject, when any persons holding

office in the Church of CHRIST, in the present day, are termed *successors of the apostles*, are said to have *succeeded to the apostolic office*; as if there were some exceeding arrogance and presumption in the claim. Whether it be arrogant or not depends entirely upon whether it be true. Nothing is so humble and unpretending as truth. Did any one claim to have succeeded to the *personal* distinctions and endowments—*the inspiration and divers miraculous gifts* by which the apostles were qualified for their extraordinary circumstances, he would indeed be chargeable with arrogant presumption; because concerning these things there was no promise of the LORD that they should continue in the Church to the end of the world. But in relation to the *office* of the apostles there is the plainest promise of such continuance, and consequently, however the assertion may sound, it must be true that somewhere in the Church at this time there are office bearers, either bishops, presbyters, or deacons, who *severally*, and in virtue of their office are successors of the apostles—occupying *individually* just that relation to the present Church which the apostles, by virtue of the essential feature of their office, sustained *individually* to the Church of their days. The prejudice that arises against such an idea will not bear a moment's reflection. If it spring from a comparison, *as to personal character and fitness*, of the modern successors, with the first in the chain, be it remembered that Judas Iscariot was numbered with the apostles by the Saviour himself, and Judas was a traitor. If the prejudice arise from the consideration that the commencement of the apostles' office was miraculous; that it was under the immediate and extraordinary designation of the Son of GOD; whereas the continuation of the gospel ministry is by the ordination of men, an ordinary designation by fallible instruments; we answer by referring you to the analogy between the new creation and the old, in regard to origin and succession. The beginning of the grass of the field was miraculous—by the instant and immediate mandate of GOD. It was created in full maturity. But its succession was provided for by no such measure. The grass, and the herb, and the fruit tree were furnished with the means of a succession by ordinary laws, each having "seed in itself, after its kind." Thus also with man. The head of the human race was created by the immediate hand of GOD, but the succession from that moment to the end of time was provided for by the laws of ordinary nature. But we hold it to be no arrogance to say of any man, though the lowest of his kind, that he has succeeded to the nature of the miraculously created first man; nor to say of the herb of the field that, though it be but the offspring of the little, familiar seed in the ground, which sprang and grew by an ordinary law and a human planting and rearing, it is, nevertheless, in all the essentials of its nature, the successor, in an unbroken line of descent, of the herb which, on the third day of the world, sprang into maturity at the wonderful fiat of the Almighty. I know not that the man, or the herb, is any the less a man or an herb, or any the less descended from the miraculous beginnings of the creation, because the laws of growth were but ordinary, and the intermediate agency of production was but human. And so I know not that a minister of the Gospel is any the less a successor of the first apostles, because instead of receiving his authority, like them, immediately from CHRIST, it has come to him by the intermediate communication of a chain fastened, at its beginning, upon the throne of GOD, and preserved as inviolate, as the line of the descent of Adam, or the succession of seed time and harvest, of day and night, of summer and winter. I know not that this day is not a true day, and strictly a successor of that very day when first the sun appeared, though that you know was made by the sudden act of GOD suspending the sun in the skies, and this arose by the ordinary succession of the evening and the morning. The beginning of every institution of GOD must of necessity be extraordinary; its regular continuance—ordinary. So with the course of Providence in all its branches. What is now an ordinary Providence was once an extraordinary. What began with miracle is continued by laws of familiar nature. And so it is with the ministry of the Gospel. What was created by the direct ordination of GOD is propagated and continued by the authorized ordination of men. Its "seed is in itself, after its kind," and at every step of the succession it is precisely the same ministry and just as much of GOD, sanctioned by his authority and sustained by his power, as if it had been received from the laying of the hands of CHRIST himself. And so with the office of the apostles. It was the promise of CHRIST, the LORD, that it should continue to the end of the world. It is not more sure that the sun and moon, seed time and harvest will continue to the end of the world; and though its succession be now in the hands of very feeble and fallible men; of men unspeakably inferior to the apostles in every personal and official qualification; yea, though many Iscariots be found under its awful responsibilities, the integrity of *the office*, as essentially identical with that of the apostles, is in no wise affected.

(*To be continued.*)

COMMUNICATIONS.

For the Churchman.

ADVERSARIA—NO. XIII.

"ut si
Cœcus iter monstrare velit, tamen adspice, si quid
Et nos, quod cures proprium fecisse, loquamur."
Hor. Ep. 1. xvii.

"At Scriptor non potest se ad unum accommodare; nisi forte *hic unus* de cognitione et gustu hominum omnium vere judicare queat. Sed quis hoc de se confirmet?" Scheller. Præf. ad Præcept, Styl. Lat.

Hunter's Horace.—Dr. Adam Clarke, in his Bibliog. Dict., remarks upon this book, "It is said no error has yet been discovered in it." Dibdin, with more caution, says it is "published with great care and correctness." But Watt repeats, "It is by some considered immaculate." It is certainly a choice and convenient edition; and the editor's province is considered as executed in the most thorough manner. The text recommends itself to every student as peculiarly elegant and satisfactory, and the selections of readings and brief critical comments, which make up the notes, are of the most useful character: though the bookseller's whim, "ne ultra modum cresceret libri moles," has deprived us of all beyond the first book of the epistles. However invaluable may be the richly-laden commentaries of learned scholars, and indispensable to the student, it has always appeared to me that to enjoy his author, after having acquired his sense and spirit, an edition as little as possible cumbered is necessary. A few readings at the end will afford him an agreeable exercise when he desires it, and perhaps with these, he will want little more. To this end, Hunter's Horace seems to have been published, and it is difficult to conceive how the end could be answered better. In regard, however, to the mechanical execution of the book, which is the object of this notice, very little it seems to me can be said; and its claims to immaculateness must fall before *eight* typographical errors which at different times I have discovered, and noted in my copy. One of these is in the text; p. 244, "quicnunce" for quincunce. The rest are in the notes, and preface, as follows:—p. xvi, "Maettarii" for Maittarii; p. 250, "12" for 8; p. 268, "vxii" for xvii; p. 274, ins. 14; p. 291, "79" for 78; p. 292, "58" for 48; p. 298, ins. vi. There may be others, as there are so many in the notes; but I think there is no other in the text than that above mentioned. The edition is a very correct one doubtless as to the text, but it cannot claim to be "immaculate."

The 12mo Baskerville Sallust and Florus.—The quarto Baskervilles are the master-pieces of that eminent printer. The duodecimos are much less valued, though the Horace in this form is very highly praised by Harwood, and the Virgil is one of the most elegant works that ever printer finished. The edition, which is the subject of these observations, is an exception to all the above. There is nothing of Baskerville but the types; and these are hardly distinguishable through bad ink, and bad paper of half a dozen different degrees of thickness. But what is of much more consequence, this edition is an incorrect one. I have noted no less than seven errors of the press in my copy, and I am far from thinking that this is all. And yet this has been called "nitida editio," and Mr. Lowndes says it brought 13*l*. at Hibbert's sale. Harwood, though it appeared only the year before his book, takes, as we should expect, no notice of it.

Hubbard's Catullus.—One of the elegant little school-classics that the Boston press has been and is now engaged in publishing. I mention these together, though by different editors and publishers, as of nearly uniform size and execution. The edition now before me is inferior in no respect to any of its companions above referred to, in so far as I have had any opportunity of judging. The difficult task of expurgation seems to have been executed with judgment and taste, and the notes and metrical key appear to leave little to desire. Reading it in connection with a good foreign edition, I observed also, that it appeared very correct. And surely, to say nothing of the rest of the poems of Catullus, his Peleus and Thetis can hardly be omitted with justice in a thorough education. We might almost as well omit Dryden's Persius, or Pope's Rape of the Lock, if this was possible, in an English course. The Epithalamium of Peleus and Thetis is one of the master-pieces of antiquity.

Dryden's Persius.—This has seemed to me one of the most vigorous and finished performances of our English literature. Dryden's Juvenal yields entirely to Gifford, and even, it may be said, to Johnson, in parts; but his Persius is inimitable. Dryden, (and the same thing may be found in Blackwall's Introd. p. 71,) in his Essay on Satire, puts Bishop Burnet, apparently with entire candor, and Sir Walter Scott (not. in loc. in Scott's edit.) seems to think, even with "respect," in what may seem a curious position. "The present Bishop of Salisbury" is represented as having "recommended this our author," [Persius] "and the tenth Satire of Juvenal, in his pastoral letter, to the serious perusal and practice of the divines in his diocese, as the best common places for their sermons, as the store-houses and magazines of moral virtues, from whence they may draw out, as they have occasion, all manner of assistance for the accomplishment of a virtuous life, which the stoics have assigned for the great end and perfection of mankind." As Dryden had made Burnet the "Buzzard" of his "Hind and Panther," this statement of the bishop's advice to his clergy, might seem to need some confirmation; and we have it in Blackwall, (above mentioned) and also in the excellent "Miscellanea in us. Jun. Acad." of the Rev. J. Painter, p. 77. Both of these authors were clergymen, and both appear to confirm what seems to me, if I may say it, a very disputable, and at least high-colored commendation of the poet; who will be more likely to suffer than gain by extravagant eulogy.

Feb. 20, 1839. PHILARCHÆUS.

For the Churchman.

Mr. Editor,—The words *domestic* and *foreign* used by your correspondent in thoughts upon missions, as you justly intimate, were by far too vague, and did not point out the distinction between missions in *Christendom* and missions among the *heathen*, as was intended. Here are two great fields for labor—one over which the Prince of life, the Saviour of the world, is acknowledged as the rightful Sovereign; the other where Satan, the great adversary of GOD and man, holds absolute and despotic sway. *Now the question is,* whether our *American Church*, in her own individual capacity, has the *right merely* to labor among the nations in *Christendom*, domestic or foreign? Whether the perishing heathen *have no claims* upon her Christian charities? This I would like to know. The *bare knowledge* of the fact, that by far the greater proportion of the world is ignorantly drawn off from their lawful allegiance to their Sovereign and Maker by the prince of darkness, and ruled by him with the iron hand of cruelty and wickedness,—I say the mere knowledge of this should I think rouse all Christendom to form themselves into a mighty army, a holy crusade, and go forth in the strength of their LORD to fight his and their battles. This I think would be a far nobler and more praiseworthy cause than was that of recovering the holy sepulchre from the hands of the infidels, which at one time aroused all Europe. The cause they would now espouse is sure to be victorious! (if the word of GOD fail not,) and in the end, if they fight manfully as good soldiers of the cross, theirs will be an eternal crown of glory! the unfading laurels of victory!

Several queries were made some time since in one of your numbers, whether we might not yet bide our time in sending the Gospel to the heathen—that they were in the hands of the same merciful King that they ever had been: whether our Church should not wait longer until she should be stronger,—comparing her to a sick person who, using his strength before recovery, would be in danger of being quite disabled. This comparison I think entirely unworthy of the *Church of the living* GOD. Were she to depend upon her own strength, then this simile might not be unfit; but, through CHRIST strengthening, she can do *all things*, and her *strength* is only made perfect in *weakness*. In spiritual things our aims cannot be too high. We cannot expect *too much* from CHRIST, nor *too little* from ourselves. It is not by might nor by power, but by my spirit saith the LORD, that sinners can be converted. Our dependence upon *means* should be less, and upon *prayer* more. When our Saviour, looking abroad upon the field of the world, and seeing it already white for the harvest, what does he command his disciples? "*Pray* ye therefore the LORD of the harvest, that he would send forth laborers into his harvest." Here then the *great duty enforced*—prayer. Our Saviour knew full well, were this sincerely engaged in, *means* would not be wanting; for then would *he himself*, the Lord of the harvest, send forth the laborers; but instead of *praying more for this*, is it not to be feared that *we ourselves*, in our own strength, are endeavoring to send forth the laborers: and so long as we do this, the harvest, which has been standing for so many years ungathered, still in this late period of Christianity will remain and be truly plenteous, but the laborers few. Did not our Church, in her wisdom, determine *her field* to be the *world*, and all men brethren? if so, would we not think, where she saw the most distress and misery and the most suffering, *there* she would send her messengers of mercy, to dispel the darkness, "to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to those that were bound?" and in so doing, would not the very exercise of her benevolence increase her strength? What is commanded of the Church in her collective capacity should I think be so complied with by every individual. Cannot the different members of our churches do something for the heathen, as well as for their own household of faith? If not how can they fulfil the apostolic injunction of doing good to all men? If individuals are not to apply these several commands of Scripture to themselves, who are to do it? Suppose all Christians should say, I will confine my charities to my own household of faith. If I do this, I cannot do good to all men, who then would declare to the heathen the unsearchable riches of CHRIST? Or if *all* should expend their charities upon the heathen what then would become of their own household of faith? should we then put asunder what GOD in his wisdom hath joined together, and so make our own judgments the criterion of duty? Should we not rather simply obey the divine command, relying with faith on the fulfillment of all those promises which are made to earnest sincere prayer. Could not our American Church alone shine as a light to the whole world, if all her members, individually, would have the same mind in them which was in their divine Exemplar and in his first followers? They were fewer in number than we, yet in a short time they spread the truth throughout the world: why cannot we do the same? is it not for *want of faith*, and self-denial, and a firm reliance on the promises? And shall we plead this as our excuse for not doing our duty? Is not the angel which St. John saw in vision *now* flying in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting Gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, saying with a loud voice, "Fear GOD, and give glory to him for the hour of his judgment is come." Let none of us refuse then to listen to the voice of this mighty angel while he is proclaiming the time of judgment, but fear GOD and give glory to him by a timely repentance, a renewed faith, and zeal in all good words and works, that when his fight shall be finished (which GOD grant none of us may attempt to oppose!) and the Gospel be preached as a witness to all nations, and the end come, we may all be prepared to hail with joy the coming of our LORD! for he says himself, Behold! I come quickly. May our hearts respond with the beloved disciple, even so, come, LORD JESUS. E.

THE CHURCHMAN.

SATURDAY, MARCH 2, 1839.

THE APOSTOLIC COMMISSION.—The argument of Bishop M'Ilvaine naturally divides itself into two parts: the one comprising the evidence derived from the apostolic age, the other commencing with the book of Revelations and adducing the testimony of the early fathers to the fact of the institution of Episcopacy. The former part of the argument will be found in our paper of to-day, the latter will appear in our next. In this way we shall furnish our readers with the body of the discourse, and we commend it to their perusal, in the confident belief that it will be read with satisfaction by the candid and inquiring; and we are pleased to think that the sermon, as well from the intrinsic weight of its arguments, as from the name and merited influence of the author, will be productive of good to the Church.

Towards the conclusion of the discourse the author intimates that some of his hearers may have been disposed to regard it as not sufficiently "*practical*," for the occasion on which it was delivered. We are aware that this complaint is often made in reference to the subject of the apostolic commission, but we think without reason. The most sublime and affecting doctrines of our holy religion are sustained by proofs of reason and Scripture, and the exhibition of these proofs, addressed, as it necessarily is, to the understanding, is devoid of what is usually termed "practical" interest. The "practical" interest of a subject is found in its application to those wants and sensibilities of our nature, by means of which it is brought into living connexion with the *practical* concerns of life. The question then is, Is the doctrine of the apostolic commission and divine institution of the ministry susceptible of an application to the wants and sensibilities of our nature? If so, there can be no want of practical interest *in the subject*; and complaints to that effect, on the part of the people, would only show that we of the clergy have not sufficiently studied the doctrine in its connexion with the heart and affections, and that therefore we fail to bring it home to "the business and bosoms" of our hearers. Now that the doctrine may be most intimately and vitally connected with the affections is capable, we think, of the fullest demonstration; and if the stirring exordium of Bishop M'Ilvaine's discourse had been transferred to its close, we venture to say that the effect of his sermon of itself would have proved—if indeed it have not already proved—the futility of the contrary complaint. To one who believes in the divine origin of the ministerial commission, that alone is sufficient proof of its adaptation to the wants of our nature. But observation, experience and inward consciousness furnish abundant testimony to the same effect. The readiness with which the people of our own country have invested the ministerial office with a character in practice which they have denied it in theory, is proof that they have felt the need of the institution and recognised its congeniality with the unsophisticated dictates of the heart. In no part of Christendom has the doctrine of the apostolic commission been more entirely repudiated than in many parts of our own country, and yet in those very places its importance has been acknowledged practically and by common consent. In particular, the administration of the sacraments has been, by the mere spontaneous force of sentiment, appropriated to a particular class of persons; and that so entirely, that it is every where considered a profanation for one not belonging to that class to baptize or celebrate the communion. Parents desirous of baptism for their offspring revolt from the profanation of receiving it at the hands of one who is confessedly a layman: and congregations deprived of the service of a clergyman convene habitually for public worship without presuming, by the celebration of the communion, to invade what their feelings, with an instinctive reverence for truth which puts to shame the pride of their understanding, compel them to regard as the peculiar prerogative, and, much as they may eschew the expression, the *divine right* of the ministerial office. This sentiment is too deep, strong, and sacred, to be resolved into a mere sense of decency and fitness: it has prevailed too long and among a people of too sturdy and independent growth to be resolved into prejudice. It is a voice springing up from the depths of our consciousness, proving the correspondence that exists between the wants of our nature and a ministry clothed with divine authority; and yielding its spontaneous testimony to the propriety of those provisions by which divine wisdom has guarded the apostolic commission from the intrusion and usurpation of man.

"There is a charm," says Dr. Chalmers,* "in the week day services of a parish minister which has not been duly estimated either by philanthropists or patriots. His official and recognised character furnishes him with a ready passport to every habitation; and he will soon find that a visit to the house of a parishioner is the surest way of finding access to his heart. Even the hardiest and most hopeless in vice cannot altogether withstand this influence; and at times in their own domestic history, there are opportunities, whether by sickness, or disaster, or death, which afford a weighty advantage to the Christian. Kindness that is brought to bear upon them. His week day attentions and their Sabbath attendance, go hand in hand." Now does this "charm" result from a mere perception on the part of the people of the utility of the relation and a sense of the benefits they derive from it? Would not the "charm" be broken if the people could divest their minds of the secret belief that their minister comes to them as the ambassador of Heaven? And must it not be immeasurably enhanced by the persuasion that their minister has not taken the office to himself but has been invested with it by an authoritative commission derived from the divine Head of the Church?

We conclude these remarks with the following curious quotation from the illustrious German poet Goethe, for which we are indebted to the Tract of Professor Pusey on Fasting, which forms No. 18 of the Oxford series. "The author is lamenting," says Dr Pusey, "'the nakedness which, Jeremy Taylor says, the excellent men of our sister Churches complained to be among themselves,' and which our own happily avoided. In the contrast there drawn, it is not a little remarkable to see, that the doctrine of Apostolical Succession, which has of late been by some regarded as cold and unpractical, is put forward as that which gives to the Romish sacraments a warmth, which the Lutheran Church does not possess. He sums up thus:—

"'All these spiritual miracles spring not, like other fruits, from the natural soil; there can they neither be sown, nor planted, nor nurtured. One must obtain them by prayer from another country; and this cannot every one do, nor at all times. Here then we are met by the highest of these symbols derived from an old venerable tradition. We hear that one man can be favored, blessed, consecrated from above more than others. Yet, in order that this may appear no mere natural gift, this high favor, united as it is with a weight of duty, must be transmitted from one commissioned individual to another; and the greatest good which man can attain, and yet cannot possess himself of by any exertions or power of his own, must be preserved and perpetuated upon earth by a spiritual inheritance. Nay, in the consecration of the priest, every thing is united, which is necessary for effectually joining in those other holy ordinances, whereby the mass of believers is benefited, without their having any other active share therein, than that of faith and unconditional confidence. And thus the priest is enrolled in the succession of those who have preceded or shall come after him, and in the circle of those anointed to the same office, to represent HIM, from whom all blessings flow; and that the more gloriously, because it is not himself whom we respect, but his office; it is not before his bidding that we bow the knee, but before the benediction which he imparts and which seems the more sacred, the more immediately derived from Heaven, because the earthly instrument cannot, by any sinfulness or viciousness of his own, weaken it, or render it powerless.'"

EPISCOPACY—TESTIMONIES OF PRESBYTERIANS.—The confession of Bogermannus, president of the Synod of Dort, to the Bishop of Landaff, when that prelate had represented the value of Episcopacy as a remedy for the evils of heresy and schism, is familiar to most readers: *Domine, non adeo felices sumus*: "Sir, we are not so happy as to enjoy the benefits of Episcopacy." It may be well to circulate a few other testimonies, showing that Bogermannus was not alone among the early continental divines in lamenting the want of bishops, and censuring the conduct of the English Presbyterians in opposing that order in the Church.

As to the early French Reformed Churches, Durell tells us, "that those who have lived among them know that they are so far from condemning Episcopacy as evil and unlawful, that they rather wish they were in a condition to enjoy the benefit thereof; most of them not sticking to say plainly, that if all the kingdom of France should embrace the Reformed doctrine, they must of necessity have bishops, and they would most freely submit to them. Wherefore," he adds, "I do not think it improbably said by some (and amongst them by * * * Dr. Peter Du Moulin * * *) that GOD having permitted the work of the Reformation to be carried on by the inferior clergy of that kingdom, they thought it meet to keep themselves within the bounds of the order of priesthood; that if ever it were GOD ALMIGHTY's will that the bishops themselves should reform and embrace the true doctrine, there might be no contestation with them for jurisdiction and pre-eminence, but all manner of readiness on the reformed ministers' part to submit to the bishops and acknowledge them for their lawful superiors and prelates."

In proof of this readiness on their part to submit to bishops, when any were found to sanction the Reformation, the author gives the following example: "A little after the Conference of Poissi, Joannes Antonius, of the illustrious family of the Coracioli, son of the most renowed Prince of Melfi, and a man of good learning, being Bishop of Troyes in the province of Champagne, was convinced of the truth of the doctrine professed in the Reformed Churches. But being desirous that his conversion might profit the people of his diocese that were committed to his charge; which he thought would hardly be unless such as had already embraced the Reformed religion did submit to his government, and acknowledge him for their bishop and pastor; he made his address unto them for that purpose, and was by them acknowledged, they willingly submitting to his government. Which submission of theirs was generally approved by all their brethren, and likewise by Peter Martyr, who passing by that town as he was returning from Poissi into Switzerland, and being acquainted with the whole business, gave his approbation unto the same; hoping that such an example might contribute much to the advancement of the Protestant religion, as he intimates to Beza in one of his epistles, where he imparteth the news of the bishop's conversion, and the Reformed Churches' submission to his pastoral care and authority." †

Du Bosc, in a letter to Dr. Brevint, 1660, writes: "We acknowledge that this order hath signal advantages; and I think not that any of my brethren will contradict me, if I say that well-ordered Episcopacy hath most important and considerable utilities which cannot be found in the Presbyterian discipline. If we have followed the last in our churches, it is not for any aversion that we have against the former: it is not because we hold Episcopacy to be contrary to the nature of the Gospel, or because we think it less convenient for the good of the Church, or less worthy of the condition of the true flocks of the LORD; but it is because *necessity* hath obliged us to it; because reformation having been begun in this kingdom by the people and by inferior Churchmen, the places of bishops remained filled with men of a contrary religion, so that we were constrained to content ourselves with ministers and elders as well as we could, for fear of setting bishop against bishop in the same town, which would have caused furious troubles and implacable wars, and put a great stop to the progress of the Gospel. If bishops had embraced the Reformation at the first, I make no doubt but that their order had been maintained in the ecclesiastical polity." [This opinion the writer maintains by reference to the example of the Bishop of Troyes mentioned above, and then concludes as follows.] "Wherefore the practice of the churches of *France* ought to be no precedent for the Church of *England*. For in the Church of *England* Reformation having been begun by the bishops, there would be reason to think it strange, if Episcopacy had not been preserved therein. And if there be any in England at this time that be so rigidly partial for Presbyterian parity, as to justle against that ancient order of Episcopacy, and seek to root it quite out to the prejudice both of *Church and State*, they cannot but be very much blamed for it."

And M. Gaches in a letter to Dr. Brevint writes:—

"The name of bishop cannot be strange to any man that is acquainted with Scripture, since it is found in Scripture. The office which that name doth intimate is lawful, since it was acknowledged from the beginning of the Christian Church. Yea, I am of this opinion, that though bishops had very much exceeded the authority which they had in the two first ages, and were not so religious as St. Cyprian, who would do nothing without his presbytery; yet that difference in government ought not to cause a division in the Church. The best men in our Churches have honored the prelates of England. And he that was sent to the Synod of Dort was respected according to his place. The name of schism may do more harm in the Church in one year, than all the excess of Episcopal authority can do in an age."

And again in another letter to the same person:—

"Would to GOD we had no differences with the bishops of France but their dignity; how cheerfully should I submit myself to them! Although you know that *their yoke is heavy*, far heavier than that of the bishops of England. How comes it to pass then that those of your Presbyterians that are great, understanding, and wise men, have such an aversion against moderate Episcopacy? And why do they refuse to have communion with Ignatius, Polycarpus, Cyprian, Chrysostom, and all that holy company of the purest antiquity? I am of that opinion, that if all ministers could be wise at all times, and keep themselves in good order, they would have no need of overseers; as there would have been no need of kings and judges if men had kept their primitive innocency. But sin hath brought in the necessity of government, and the failings of ministers make the order of bishops necessary."

Le Moyne writes to the same effect:—

"Truly, I believe not that it is possible to keep either peace or order in your Church without preserving the Episcopal dignity. And I confess that I conceive not by what spirit they are led that oppose that government, and cry it down with such violence. For I defy any man, whosoever he be, to show me if he can, another order more suitable with reason, yea, or better agreeing with holy Scripture, and of which GOD hath made more use for the establishment of his truth, and the amplification of his kingdom."

Again:—

"But if ever any in this particular made their ungratefulness notorious, certainly they are the English opposers of Episcopacy, who will not consider that they owe their reformation to the care and zeal of their bishops, who did so wonderfully well repurge the Church of England a hundred years ago, and so happily set up the holy truth again in its genuine lustre."

And still further:—

"In effect, Sir, there is no other power but the Episcopal can remedy an infinity of evils, that may arise in the Church. For I beseech you let us not flatter ourselves, in France where we have a Presbyterian government, are we not subject unto many divisions, which the equality of pastors is not able to compose? And which a synod consisting of equal persons, and of elders and deacons (who many times have little skill in ecclesiastical government) is not able to stop, because the authors of the evil hold themselves to be of equal power with those that are of prime note, and despise most of them that are ordinarily employed to heal those distempers? Who knows not that in the low countries all the universities have some differences which the authority of bishops might have ended long ago, and which would break out with more violence, did not the secular authority keep the evil from growing further? Are not our adversaries very happy in that point? For were it not for their Episcopal government they would be torn into a thousand factions; and that great body of the Roman Church would in a short time be dismembered. But having superiors, who watch over a whole diocese, or over a whole province, the evil is speedily prevented, and the factious are constrained to yield. They have always some deference and some respect for the superiors, and the union being howsoever always preserved, the evil is not so scandalous and of such dangerous consequence. It is that which upholds the Lutheran Churches. For in Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and Germany they are very quiet under the Episcopal discipline, and seldom are they seen to slander and tear one another. Whereas other governments have much ado to avoid that. Why then should we be so unreasonable as to refuse to make profit of that and apply to ourselves that which we see practised with such advantageous success in the eyes of all the world?"

Another clergyman of the French Church, M. de L'Angle, gives his own testimony with that of Daille, Amiraut, and Bochart:—

"And I cannot tell what those haters of the peace of the Church mean that prattle up and down, and talk as if the French Churches were great adversaries to the Episcopal order; and as if we held it quite contrary unto CHRIST's kingdom, and affirmed it to be a foul relic of Antichristianism. GOD forbid, Sir, that we should have such a perverse and rash opinion. I am sure that neither Monsieur Daille, nor Monsieur Amiraut, nor Monsieur Bochart, nor any of my collegues of Rouen ever approved of it; I that am the least of my brethren am as far from it as any. Truly an Episcopacy distracted and carried about within and without the walls of our Jerusalem to several abuses; an Episcopacy altogether independent and lawless, making of a man's will his law, doing all the functions of such an important ministry with its particular and despotical pleasure, is an unlucky and horrible thing in the house of GOD, drawing near to Antichristianity if it be not rather a part of it. But an Episcopacy well tempered and well poised, an Episcopacy framed after the model which was exercised with so much success by those prelates of the Apostolic Churches which CHRIST calls angels, such as Clemens, Polycarpus, Iræneus, Cyprianus, Athanasius, Chrysostom, and Austin, and many others of the like kind, who have been in the Church the sweet savor of CHRIST: it is a most sacred and most ancient order, and if the apostles themselves were not the authors of it, certainly it was instituted by apostolic men, who might say of their ordinances of this nature, the same that the apostle said sometimes after he had gravely resolved some questions, about which he had no express command from GOD, I think also that I have the Spirit of GOD."

M. Gayon writes as follows:—

"I must confess that we have been strangely deceived in this country by what hath been related unto us touching the English Presbyterians. I did always imagine that they were a sort of people that followed the same order that we have here in our Churches of France. But it seems they are very far from it. The description which you make of them, shows that they are a strange sect which is not to be tolerated. And I conceive that the best remedy for such a disorder and confusion, will be to reduce them all under the Episcopal government: for I hold it impossible that the Church of England can ever be quiet and flourish otherwise."

And M. Drelincourt:—

"As Germany and Switzerland have their inspectors and superintendents, and Denmark and Sweden their bishops, I see no reason why any one should be offended if England hath likewise her bishops. If there be no bishops in the reformed Churches of France, it is because our condition cannot bear it, and that nothing can be imagined better, and fitter as things stand at present among us, then the equality of ministers."

* * * * *

"In this kingdom, and all others where we see no bishops, but such as depend on the Pope, and are zealous promoters of his doctrine, the very name of bishop is odious. But it ought not to be so in England, where there have been bishops so Christian, so orthodox, and so zealous; and who have contributed so much to the reformation of the Church, that some of them have sealed the pure truth of the Gospel even with their own blood, and have showed in the midst of the fire an angelical and divine flame, by which they were carried up into heaven."

These and similar testimonies may be found in Durell; but perhaps the most curious is the following letter from Peter Du Moulin touching the suppression of an important passage in a work of the great champion of Presbyterianism, Mr. David Blondel. The letter is addressed to Dr. Durell.

"*My Reverend Brother*, to cast my mite into that rich treasury which you are now furnishing, I must inform you of a remarkable passage very pertinent to your purpose. In the year 1651, that great and good man, my Lord Primate Usher, told me that the learned Mr. David Blondel had concluded his Apologia pro Hieronymo with words to this purpose. 'By all that we have said to assert the rights of the presbytery, we do not intend to invalid the ancient and apostolical constitution of Episcopal pre-eminence. But we believe that wheresoever it is established conformably to the ancient canons it must be carefully preserved, and wheresoever by some heat of contention or otherwise it hath been put down or violated, it ought to be reverently restored.' The good primate told me besides, that whereas the book had been written at the earnest request of the Assembly of Westminster, of the Scots especially, who had their agents and leagers in Paris to strengthen their party by misinforming the Protestants of France, and winning them to their side. When these agents saw this conclusion of Mr. Blondel's manuscript they expostulated with him very loud for marring all the good he had done in his book, disappointing the expectation of the Assembly, and showing himself an enemy instead of a friend to their holy covenant. This they urged upon him with such vehemency and unwearied importunity, that they prevailed with him to put out that conclusion. Having received that information from a person of so much knowledge and integrity, as that famous prelate, yet for a further confirmation I told it to Mr. John Blondel (David's brother) then living in London, who denied that there was any truth in that report, and defended his brother as much wronged by it. If you think (said I) that I wrong your brother, complain to him of me in your next letter, and remember my kind service to him. Mr. John Blondel did not fail to write to his brother about this. And three or four weeks after showed me a letter from him, wherein he remembered his love to me, and acknowledged that the relation was true.

"This advice I thought myself obliged to give you, knowing that no man can make a better use of it than yourself, to whose holy labors about this point, the Church is so much indebted, and none more your debtor in the Church in that regard than, your most affectionate brother and servant,

PETER DU MOULIN."

For the Churchman.

OXFORD TRACTS.

Rev. Sir,—I have been informed that one of our large publishing houses intends reprinting "Hooke's sermons," and the "Oxford Tracts." Believing, that in so doing, they will serve the best interests of the Church, I hope they will lose no time in their undertaking. A.

REMARKS.—The republication of Dr. Hook's sermons would give us extreme satisfaction. In regard to the Oxford Tracts, however, we are constrained to speak with more reserve. In two respects the republication of them would do good: in the first place, it would open to the American Church the sources of direct information respecting the Oxford divines, and thus shield them from the shafts of calumny and misrepresentation by securing for them the benefit of an intelligent approval or condemnation; and in the next place, it would bring into circulation a system of theology widely different from the views which generally prevail in our country, and would thus lead to a wholesome collision of mind. We confess our fears, however, that the good would not be without alloy; for although, from a sense of justice, we have endeavored to avert the calumnies which have been thrown upon the Oxford divines and have been especially pleased with the manly efforts of Dr. Hook in their behalf, we still continue to feel—and we have no wish to conceal the fact—the apprehensions which we have before intimated, that they have transcended those limits within which the best sons of the Church of England—as, for instance, Stillingfleet, Bull, Hammond, Waterland, &c. (and Bp. Hobart among us)—have restrained their views. On the doctrine of justification, for example, which has been considered a dividing line between the Churches of England and Rome, we find it impossible to acquit Mr. Newman of having substantially espoused the Roman side, and surrendered the views which, as we have been accustomed to think, discriminate the Church of England from the Romanists on the one hand, and a certain class of divines, whom, for want of a better appellative, we have termed Puritans, (Mr. Newman would say

* Blunt's History of St. Paul, p. 214.

† Ab omnibus unanimiter ut verus episcopus agnitus et receptus. Quare ipsius authoritas multum ecclesiæ Dei commodet; Deus laudetur qui ad hunc modum Filii sui regnum gubernat et dirigit.

Lutherans) on the other. In regard to other dividing lines, such as tradition, the authority of the Church, &c., we cannot speak with equal confidence, not having critically read the works which have been charged with an undue approximation to Rome. Heartily however as we approve of many of the tracts which we have read, and much as we dislike the nibbling criticism with which they have been assailed, we have yet seen enough to awaken our apprehensions, that on other fundamental questions, as well as on justification, the Oxford divines are in danger of effacing those lines which broadly discriminate us from Rome and Geneva, and an adherence to which has formed, and we hope will continue to form, the distinctive character and glory which the Protestant Episcopal Church of this country has inherited from her venerable mother.

If our views are wrong, or our fears unfounded, we can only say that we are open to conviction, and shall be ever ready most cheerfully to make reparation to men for whose piety and learning we cherish a profound respect. With these views and fears, however, we are of course prevented from hailing the republication of the Oxford Tracts with the same satisfaction which we should feel in reference to works in which we had full confidence. Still we should be pleased at their republication; for although we cannot commend them as guides in doctrine to the mass of readers, yet we can most cordially recommend them to the reflecting as helps to devotion and stimulants to inquiry. Truth is no loser by freedom of discussion; and the more the public are led to compare extreme views, the more inclined, we believe, they will be to settle down in those verities which have given to the Reformed Church of England the impress of wisdom and moderation.

We apprehend that the religious movement in Oxford has as yet been but imperfectly estimated. Public attention has been too much fixed upon what Calvin would have morosely termed its fopperies; the use of saints' days as ordinary dates, and other fond things which are possibly salutary and certainly harmless. But we misjudge the case if we see in all this nothing more than the ebullition of devotional feeling. There is too much of learning and system in the leaders of the new school to suppose that they have not laid their foundations broad and deep. We are rather inclined to regard them not so much as zealous ministers attempting to revive the piety of their Church, as profound religious philosophers who are seeking to recast the popular mind of their country on principles which have long been dormant. In reading their writings we cannot divest ourselves of the conviction that there are some esoteric doctrines which are not yet fully disclosed; there is an occasional mistiness, which argues the Platonist in philosophy, and a revival of scholastic subtleties under a veil of sublime piety, which will leave us without surprise if they should turn out to be absolute predestinarians in theology. Such a movement cannot but excite a lively interest among inquiring minds in this country; and the gratification of such a spirit of inquiry is a good reason for being pleased with the announcement in the communication which is placed at the head of the present remarks. We say then, let the tracts be republished and let them be read.

Nor are we to be deterred from this wish by the apprehension that the republication of the tracts among us will make converts to what are deemed their peculiar views. We have indeed greatly mistaken the character of our age and country if it is in danger of any errors which have a leaning to Rome. The tendency is all the other way; and we confess we look without alarm on a movement which, if not in all respects defensible, is yet calculated to form a counterpoise to the spirit of division, misrule, and fanaticism. Of high Churchmen at least we have no fears; they will never knowingly sustain the Oxford Tracts any farther than those tracts are sustained by the standard writers of their Church; and if others who are now wedded to the jejune and impalpable inanitions from which the Oxford divinity has sprung, and which it is laboring heartily, and we trust successfully to dissipate, can be persuaded to exchange their shadows for something more substantial and solid, we can only say that it is a consummation devoutly to be wished for.

Life of the Cardinal De Cheverus, Archbishop of Bordeaux. By the Reverend J. HUEN DOUBOURG, ex-professor of Theology, translated from the French by Robert M. Walsh. Philadelphia: Hooker & Claxton. 1839.

We conclude this week the extracts from the life of Cheverus, which we began to give in our last.—We observe that the Episcopal Recorder of last week, speaking from *personal knowledge*, declares the biography, "in regard to the facts which it professes to state, amazingly unfounded," and fortifies the declaration by the testimony of another pen, that says, "More misstatement we do not remember to have found within so small a compass." The style of the book is evidently hyperbolical, but we had supposed that the facts alleged were substantially true. If the statement, however, of the Recorder be correct, the work is not a biography, but a religious romance.—We feel no particular interest in the subject, but deem it right that a responsible statement, like that of the Recorder, should accompany our extracts in order that our readers may be put on their guard.

"A more remarkable circumstance than even the foregoing, was that which occurred among the soldiers of the garrison of Montauban. Observing that they rarely attended at church, and that the jubilee was passing without any fruit to them, M. de Cheverus undertook to awaken them to a sense of their duty. Day after day he preached to them in the mode best calculated to inspire them with a wish to comply with the requisitions of their religion. At length, edified by his zeal, and moved by his exhortations, they asked to approach the sacraments. He immediately sent confessors to them, confessed many himself, and having brought them to the proper dispositions, conducted them in person, during several successive days, to the different churches to make their jubilee stations. It was a spectacle which the inhabitants of Montauban will never forget, that of a body of soldiers marching behind their bishop, with an air and deportment of the utmost seriousness, and with prayers upon their lips, attracted by their hearts alone; for M. de Cheverus had taken care that authority should have no part in the affair, but that all should be entirely spontaneous."

RELIEF OF THE CLERGY.

"The first result of his pastoral visits, and of the knowledge which he acquired of his diocese, was also a work of charity. Two great evils had attracted his notice during his apostolical journeys—one, the distressing situation of certain priests, who having given every thing to the poor, were reduced themselves to the utmost indigence by a long and expensive illness, or some unforeseen accident; the other the sad condition of several parishes, which were destitute of instruction, of public service, of almost every kind of ministry, because their pastors were too old and infirm to perform their duties, and could not be deprived of their places without a species of cruelty. Anxious to provide a remedy for these evils, the archbishop proposed to his assembled clergy an annual subscription for the formation of a common fund, to be employed in furnishing pensions to priests whom age or infirmities rendered incapable of service, and giving succor to those whom sickness or accident reduced to want. The proposition, seconded as it was by all his eloquence as well as by the consideration of the advantages which each subscriber might derive from it, was eagerly adopted. As the chief of the clergy he placed his name at the head of the list for a thousand francs a year, and in order that his death might not cause his subscription to cease, he invested a capital of twenty thousand francs in the name of the fund, which secures for ever the annual amount of the first subscription. He rejoiced in the thought that he would not only be the support and benefactor of his clergy during life, but that after his death, his charity would endure for them from age to age. He did not, however, restrict himself to his subscription, but ever and anon deposited in the fund whatever he could spare from his accustomed alms. On one occasion he bestowed upon it the sum of ten thousand francs, which a charitable person had placed at his disposal, and he also directed his testamentary executor to add to it a sum of three thousand francs, if he should leave any thing at his death—an injunction which has been faithfully fulfilled. To assist his clergy in their need was his favorite work. 'I know no charity,' he used to say, 'better placed than that which assists a priest whose head has been blanched in the labors of the ministry, and who is poor because he has himself been charitable.' The clergy of Bordeaux will never forget the interest and fervor with which he recommended every year in the ecclesiastical retreats this good work, of which he had the glory of being, as it were, the founder in France, and which was subsequently imitated by so many dioceses."

PROMPTITUDE.

"On several occasions of that sort the acuteness of his intellect, assisted by the blessing which GOD ever bestows upon such dispositions of heart, obtained the most consoling success. He was requested to preach one Good Friday before the Polytechnic School, an undertaking which his friends were apprehensive he would not be able to achieve, as the year before a distinguished archbishop had been forced, by the tumultuous conduct of the pupils, to leave the pulpit, notwithstanding his eloquence and illustrious birth. M. de Cheverus, however, went, and choosing for his text these words of the apostle, 'I determined not to know any thing among you save JESUS CHRIST, and him crucified.' Non judicavi me scire aliquid inter vos nisi Jesum Christum et hunc crucifixum—began as follows:—'If it were incumbent upon me to speak of human sciences, it would be to this learned school, it would be to yourselves, gentlemen, that I should come to be taught; but it is my duty to-day to speak of the science of the cross; this is my particular science, the science which I have studied and preached for forty years among savage tribes as well as in civilized countries, because it is equally suited to all; and you will permit an old bishop to communicate to you the fruit of his protracted studies.' This insinuating exordium won all hearts. The most perfect silence, the most earnest attention, the liveliest interest, welcomed all the words of the 'old bishop;' and he left the young men as well pleased with them as they were with him."

OPINION RESPECTING THE UNITED STATES.

"The king was very fond of conversing with M. de Cheverus. Wearied with the hostile imputations which were incessantly thrown out against his government in the name of liberty, he one day questioned him about the United States, and received a full account of the freedom which is there accorded to religion and education. 'There,' said the archbishop, alluding to the complaints of certain journals of the period, 'there I could have established missions in every church, founded seminaries in every quarter, and confided them to the care of the Jesuits, without any one thinking of saying aught against my proceedings; all opposition to them would have been regarded as an act of despotism and a violation of right. There I could have refused burial to any one unworthy of it, and the idea of compelling me to give it would appear ridiculous.' 'That people, at least,' sighed the king, 'understands liberty; when will it be understood among us?'"

"As he had passed twenty-seven years in America, living happily and tranquilly under a republican government, which considered him one of its best citizens, many supposed him to be a partisan of liberal institutions. But he never allowed himself to meddle with theories as to the best form of government, esteeming these high social questions 'much beyond the reach of his intellect,' and professing to 'know nothing about them.' In practice he adhered to the general principle followed by the Church at every period, to respect the established government, whatever it might be, and to preserve with it the best possible understanding, since religion and society both gain from the concord of the two powers, as much as they suffer by their disunion. Feeling that as a bishop he ought to be the pastor, the father, and the friend of all alike, called as he was to labor for the salvation of all, he was anxious to efface every mark of the politician, so that all might look upon him in a friendly light. Thence the silence always observed at the Episcopal Palace on the subject of politics, which he never adverted to, nor allowed to be mentioned in his presence. Thence his care never to allude to it, directly or indirectly, in his public discourses, except on two occasions, when he deemed himself compelled by the force of circumstances, to swerve from his rule. He preached nothing but the Scriptures and charity; he was the man of GOD revealing the mysteries of heaven, and expounding its laws; never the man of the world, degrading the words of divine wisdom to a level with those of human folly, by casting them into the whirlwind of opinions, in which the children of the earth are for ever involved."

FREE EPISCOPAL CHURCH FOR THE PEOPLE OF COLOR.—This congregation, formerly under the charge of the Rev. W. W. Niles, and at present under Rev. I. G. De Grasse, is now appealing to the Christian community for aid to erect a building for their accommodation. The encouragement of this free church has a powerful claim upon the sympathy of the Christian public, when it is considered that out of a vast population of *twenty thousand* colored citizens, there are at the least possible calculation, *twelve thousand* among us who are actually living without the enjoyment of any religious advantages whatever.

Such are the facts which have been communicated to us, and they lead us to hope that this enterprise will excite the attention, and meet with liberal encouragement from the friends of Christianity—and particularly the friends of the Church. The acknowledged and superior adaptation of the services of our Church for the moral and spiritual improvement of this class of people should furnish an additional inducement to us to extend to them in the present instance a helping hand.

SUNDAY SCHOOL ANNIVERSARY.—We are requested to state, that for the Sunday School Anniversary to be celebrated on Thursday, April 4th, the portion appointed for the scholars to sing is the 10th hymn, the first 5 and the 11th verses; to the tune *Arlington*.

PRAYERS FOR THE DEAD.—On our last page will be found the decision of Sir Herbert Jenner, in the case of Mary Woolfrey, who, as lately stated in our paper, was cited to appear in the Arches Court, Canterbury, and answer to the charge of having unlawfully erected a tombstone in the churchyard of Carisbrooke, and caused an inscription to be made thereon contrary to the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England. The case is so novel, and the decision so replete with learning, that the reader will have no cause to regret the space which it occupies. By way of appendix to the opinion of the court we have inserted the extract from the Homily on Prayer, which seems to have presented the strongest objection to the mind of the judge. The decision is said, in the journal from which we have copied it, to have given much dissatisfaction, and to have called forth a public expression of disapprobation from the Bishop of London. One thing is very clear, that the Church regards the practice referred to as unsustained by a shadow of scriptural authority.

We have heard with deep regret, of the death of the Rev. HUGH JAMES ROSE, well known to many of the clergy of this country who have visited England. Mr. Rose died at Florence while travelling for his health, and was at the period of his death the principal of King's College, London, and editor of the British Magazine.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—"D. F. N. H." is received. "D." is informed that we have not yet been able to obtain a copy of Oxford Tract, No. 75. If a copy is loaned to us we will comply with D's. request. "Sabbath Musings," No. 2, in our next.

A notice of Blunt's Lectures on St. Paul, and of other books and pamphlets are prepared but unavoidably deferred to our next.

☞ The resolutions of the vestry of Christ Church, Greenwich, in approbation of their late rector, the Rev. Joseph Nicols, were not received in time for insertion this week.

☞ Bishop Onderdonk's next lecture to candidates for orders, and young men desirous of becoming candidates, will be delivered in the chapel of St. Peter's Church, to-morrow evening, 3d instant. Service to commence at 7 o'clock.

☞ Bishop Onderdonk requests that those Deacons of this Diocese who wish to apply for Priest's Orders during the ensuing season, will give him immediate information thereof.

He also requests immediate information what consecrations of churches are expected to take place, with the times respectively when it is supposed they will be ready.

DIOCESAN RECORD.

BISHOP ONDERDONK'S APPOINTMENTS FOR THE ANNUAL CONFIRMATIONS IN NEW YORK AND BROOKLYN.

Fourth Sunday in Lent, March 10, Christ Church, *New York.*

Sunday next before Easter, March 24, French Church Du St. Esprit.

First Sunday after Easter, April 7, St. Stephen's Church.

Second Sunday after Easter, April 14, Grace Church.

Third Sunday after Easter, April 21, St. George's Church.

Fourth Sunday after Easter, April 28, St. Paul's Church, *Brooklyn.*

CLERICAL CHANGES.—The Rev. Charles W. Hackley, presbyter, and the Rev. Daniel S. Lewis, deacon, having removed from this diocese to that of Mississippi, and been there received, have changed accordingly their canonical residence.

Episcopal Acts by the Bishop of this Diocese.—City of Brooklyn.—Second Sunday in Lent, and Festival of St. Matthias the Apostle, February 24, confirmed 26 in St. John's Church.

Clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church, residing in the cities of New York and Brooklyn, with their respective residences.

Onderdonk, D D, Right Rev Benjamin T, 106 Franklin.
Anthon, D D, Rev Henry, 15 Stuyvesant.
Balch, Rev. Lewis P. W., 766 Broadway.
Bayard, D D, Rev Lewis P, 106 Amity.
Berrian, D D, Rev William, 50 Varick.
Blake, D D, Rev John L, 303 East Broadway.
Carder, Rev James D, 663 Broadway.
Cooke, Rev James W, 23 Cliff.
Eastburn, D D, Rev Manton, 5 Mercer.
Forbes, Rev John M. 371 Hudson.
Frazer, Rev Alexander, 174 East Broadway.
Haight, Rev Benjamin I, 3 Rutgers Place.
Halsey, Rev Charles H, 453 Houston.
Hammell, Rev William, 56 Carmine.
Hart, Rev Abram B, Harlem.
Hawks, D D, Rev Francis L, 453 Houston
Henry, D D. Rev Caleb S. 3 Park Place.
Higbee, Rev Edward Y, 324 Greenwich.
Huddart, Rev R Townsend, Bloomingdale.
Jones, Rev Charles. Third Avenue, between 18 and 19
Jones, Rev Lot, 192 Allen.
Lyell, D D, Rev Thomas, 77 Anthony.
McVickar, D D, Rev John, 8 College Green.
Manney, Rev Solon W, corner of Avenue D and Tenth.
Milnor, D D, Rev James, 82 Beekman.
Morris, Rev William, 76 Varick.
Niles, Rev William W, 12 Ridge.
Peck, Rev Isaac, 77 Anthony.
Peers, Rev Benjamin O. 20. City Hall Place.
Pound, Rev. Jesse, corner Harrison and Staple.
Price, Rev Joseph Henry, 24 Bayard.
Pyne, Rev. Smith, Jersey city.
Richmond, Rev James C, Bloomingdale.
Richmond, Rev William, 13 Murray.
Schroeder, D D, Rev John F, 77 White.
Seabury, D D, Rev Samuel, 365 Hudson.
Shimeall, Rev. R. C 13 Roosevelt.
Smith, D. D. Rev Hugh, 95 Twentieth.
Staunton, Rev William. 94 Eighteenth.
Taylor, D D, Rev Thomas H, 1 Rector.
Turner, D D, Rev Samuel H, Theological Seminary, Chelsea Square, Twentieth.
Vaughan, Rev John A, 55Morton.
Verren, Rev Antoine, 99 Franklin.
Warner. Rev Thomas,
Wainwright, D D, Rev Jonathan M, 30 Beach.
Whittingham, D D, Rev William R, Theological Sem., Chelsea Square, Twentieth.
Williams, Rev Peter, (colored) 68 Crosby.
Wilson, D D, Rev Bird, Theological Seminary, Chelsea Square, Twentieth.

Brooklyn.

Brittan, Rev Thomas S, 117 Nassau.
Coit, D D, Rev Thomas W. Washington Avenue.
Cutler, D D, Rev Benjamin C, 152 Washington.
Goddard, Rev Kingston, Pacific, between Clinton and Henry.
Johnson, Rev Evan M, corner of Pearl.
Messenger, Rev John F, Lawrence, near Willoughby.

Williamsburgh.

Davis, Rev. Samuel C., No. 3 Leacraft's Brick Buildings, South Second-street.

CALENDAR.

MARCH.

3. Third Sunday in Lent.
10. Fourth Sunday in Lent.
17. Fifth Sunday in Lent.
24. Sunday before Easter.
25. Monday before Easter and Festival of the Annunciation.
26. Tuesday before Easter.
27. Wednesday before Easter.
28. Thursday before Easter.
29. Good Friday.
30. Easter-Even.
31. Easter Day.

NOTICES.

The Standing Committee of the Eighth Avenue Sunday School, after numerous unsuccessful attempts to relieve themselves of the debt with which they are now burdened, as a last resort, they have decided upon holding a fair in Easter week; the ladies attached to the school having generously proffered their services. The place of holding the fair will be made known in a future notice. Donations of any articles suitable for the object will be thankfully received at the residence of the Treasurer, No. 100 Twentieth-street; Protestant Episcopal Press, 142 Fulton-street; Protestant Episcopal Sunday School Union, 28 Ann-street; or with Messrs. Swords, Stanford & Co., No. 152 Broadway. 24—3ts.

The regular monthly meeting of the Executive Committee of the Young Men's Missionary Society of St. Luke's Church, will be held on Monday evening, in the vestry-room, at half-past seven.

By order,
February 28, 1839. STEPHEN GREENLAND, Sec'y.

A stated meeting of the Board of Managers of the New York Protestant Episcopal Sunday School Society, will be held in the Sunday school-room of St. John's Chapel, on Monday evening, the 4th instant, at half-past seven o'clock.

By order,
A. W. O. SPOONER, *Recording Secretary.*
New York, March 2, 1839.

On Sunday morning a collection will be made in St. John's Chapel, for the benefit of the Education and Missionary Society of the Diocese of New York. The liberal aid of its friends is solicited to meet the stipends for forty-three beneficiaries and sixty-one missionaries, appointed by the institution.

All Saints' Church will be opened for divine service every Sunday evening during Lent, at half-past seven o'clock. 5t.

THE STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE DIOCESE OF NEW YORK.

The attention of candidates for orders, and other persons interested in the proceedings of the Standing Committee, is particularly directed to the following resolutions of that body:—

"*Resolved,* That the Secretary call a meeting of this committee on the first Monday of every month, at two o'clock, P. M., provided there be papers in his hands requiring its action.

"*Resolved.* That special meetings be called only in cases of *extreme urgency*, and on the written warrant to that effect of the chairman of this committee.

"*Resolved,* That whenever a special meeting of the committee is called, the Secretary shall specify in his notice the purpose for which such meeting is called.

"*Resolved,* That it is expedient and proper that all papers to be acted upon by this committee, be addressed by the applicant in whose favor they are drawn, directly to the Secretary.

"*Resolved,* That an official notice of these resolutions be inserted at least once a month, in such of the Church journals as the Secretary may deem expedient.

THOMAS HOUSE TAYLOR,
Secretary of the Standing Committee."

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

DOMESTIC MISSIONS.

The Treasurer of the Committee for Domestic Missions, since his report of the 20th instant, has received the following contributions, viz.

From the Ladies' Circle of Industry, of Bellows Falls, Vt, $30; for the Diocese of Illinois, from J F S, Esq, N Y, $150. By the hands of George Cleveland, Esq, received from the Society for the Advancement of Christianity of Christ church, Mobile, Ala, in redemption of their pledge in 1838, $500. Received by the hands of A P Merrill, Esq, receiving agent at Natchez, Mississippi, $225; from Mrs Sherred, of Trinity parish, N Y, for domestic missions, $10; donation from the Misses Crawfords, Green Bay, $30. By the hands of the Rev William H Barnwell, rector of St Peter's church, Charleston, S C, from the offerings of that church, $26; from a lady of the same church, $6, and from the Rev B C Webb, $5—$37. By the hands of the Rev Dr Reed, the amount of a collection for domestic missions, in Christ church, Poughkeepsie, N Y, on the first Sunday in Lent, $22. Total receipts, $1004.

February 27, 1839. JAMES SWORDS, Treasurer.

FOREIGN MISSIONS.

The Treasurer has further to acknowledge,

Received per Rev John A Vaughan, from Master Wm Y D, Lancaster county, Penn, part of annual subscription for Africa, per Rev William Bryant, $3. Received from Rev George Taft, rector of St Paul's church, North Providence, R I, one half of $16 50, $8 25. Remitted by Rev W H Barnwell, D D, rector of St Peter's church, Charleston, S C, from St Peter's Working Society, for Mrs Hill's school, $100; for Crete mission, $100; offerings of the church, for African mission, $26; from Rev Benjamin C Webb, for education of a boy in the school at Cape Palmas, $15, general purposes, $2, $17—$243. Received by the hands of Robert Gracie, Esq., collection in St Thomas' church, N Y, Sunday, February 24, after sermon, by Rev John A Vaughan, $251 4. Remitted by Mr Samuel Ames, superintendent, offerings of the Sunday school attached to St Stephen's church, Providence, R I, $4 12. Remitted by Rev John T Brooke, rector, from the Sunday School Society of Christ church, Cincinnati, for China, $25, for general purposes, $19, $44. Total receipts, $553 41.

CHARLES J. ALDIS, Treasurer,
February 26, 1839. Bank of America.

PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL EDUCATION AND MISSIONARY SOCIETY.

The Treasurer of the Protestant Episcopal Education and Missionary Society of the Diocese of New York acknowledges the receipt of the following sums—

Feb 13 Received contribution from Zion church, Pierrepont Manor, Jefferson county, by the hands of W C Pierrepont, Esq, $15. Feb. 26, received contribution from Emmanuel church, Little Falls, Herkimer county, per the Rev Thomas Towell, $12 50—$27 50. 1839.

Education Disposable Fund.

Feb 13, received a contribution from Zion church, Pierrepont Manor, Jefferson county, per W C Pierrepont, Esq, $15.

BENJAMIN M. BROWN, Treasurer.
New York, February 27, 1839.

CITY MISSION.

The subscriber gratefully acknowledges the receipt of $5 for the poor, from James F Depeyster, per Mr Wadsworth.

ALEXANDER FRASER, 174 East Broadway.
February 27, 1839.

P. S. Any donations of money or clothing for the benefit of the poor, will be thankfully received by Louis Sherman, 142 Fulton street, by the agent, 28 Ann street, or at the residence of the missionary, 174 East Broadway.

GENERAL PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL SUNDAY SCHOOL UNION.

The Treasurer of the General Protestant Episcopal Sunday School Union, acknowledges the receipt of the following donation:—

From the Male Society of Grace church, Philadelphia, for the promotion of religion, by the Rev William Suddards, $30.

JOHN W. MITCHELL,
Treas. of Gen. Prot. Epis. S. S. Union.

CITY MISSION SOCIETY.

The treasurer of the New York Protestant Episcopal City Mission Society acknowledges the receipt of the following sums:—

Annual subscriptions—From W R W, $20; G N Titus, $5; S H Foster, $50 D H, donation, $20. From the treasurer of the Church Building Society, the following donations:—M Robinson, $40; M Hoffman, $40; Isaac Lawrence, $60; J A Perry, $50; J C Hamilton, $40; Joseph Petit, $90; James Swords, $9; William G Ward, jun. $22 50; Mrs M Lorillard, $90; Mrs James Boggs, $90; Mrs Richard Ray, $90; Mrs M J Delancey, $13 50; E A B Graves, $45. The balance of the funds of the church building in the hands of the treasurer, $137 37, making a total of $912 37.

LEWIS PHILLIPS, Treasurer.
No. 54 Wall street.

MISSION CHURCH OF THE EPIPHANY.

The subscriber gratefully acknowledges the receipt of $10, for the poor, from James F Depeyster, Esq, by the hands of William R Wadsworth, Esq.
February 26, 1839. LOT JONES, 192 Allen st.

GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

The treasurer acknowledges the following receipts, viz.—

From Rev Thomas C Dupont, per Mr C J Aldis, a contribution by the church of the Holy Trinity, Grahamville, S C, $28; from Mr Thomas S Underhill, a collection made in All Saints' church, New York, $70; from Rev Robert B Croes, the thanksgiving offering of St Peter's church, Freehold, and of St Peter's church, Spotswood, N J, $4 56.

February 25, 1839. WM. H. HARISON, Treasurer.

ST. MATTHEW'S PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL FREE CHURCH.

The treasurer acknowledges the receipt of the following sums, since the last, to maintain public worship and Sunday school, for the current year.

Thomas Oatis, Esq, $5; Benjamin Loder, Esq, $5; Jacob R Leroy, Esq, $5; cash, $5; Joseph Petit, Esq, $3; cash, $2; Mr John Davis, $1; John W Mitchell, Esq, $2—$28.

Feb. 21, 1838. HENRY WILLIAMS, Treasurer.

Any donations for the above object will be thankfully received by William Hinton, Esq.

PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL TRACT SOCIETY.

The Treasurer acknowledges the receipt of the following sums.

From Mr Samuel T Skidmore, annual, $2; annual subscribers, collected, $7; a member of All Saints' church, donation, $1—$10.

Contributions, donations, and annual subscriptions now due, will be thankfully received at 77 Maiden-lane, by
THOMAS BROWNING, Treasurer,
Or at the Depository, 28 Ann street, by
THOMAS C. BUTLER, agent
Where may be had the society's tracts.

MISSION CHURCH OF THE HOLY EVANGELISTS.

The subscriber gratefully acknowledges the receipt of $10, from James F Depeyster, Esq, through Mr W R Wadsworth; and $2 from Miss E Beers, through Messrs Swords & Stanford, for the poor.

Feb. 27, 1839. JESSE POUND, 5 Harrison street.

Donations of money, clothing, or articles to make it, will be thankfully received, if left with Swords, Stanford & Co, 152 Broadway; Louis Sherman, at the Protestant Episcopal Press, 142 Fulton-street; or Jesse Pound, 5 Harrison-street.

NEW YORK BIBLE AND COMMON PRAYER-BOOK SOCIETY.

The Treasurer gratefully acknowledges the receipt of the following sums:—

From Mr Samuel T Skidmore, annual, $3; a friend, through the agent of the Churchman, $4; sundry annual subscriptions, $22—$29.

Contributions, donations, and annual subscriptions now due, will be thankfully received at No 77 Maiden-lane by
THOMAS BROWNING, Treasurer.
Or at the Depository, 28 Ann street, by
THOMAS C BUTLER, agent.
Where may be had the Society's Bibles, Testaments, and folio, octavo, and 18mo, Prayer-books.

EIGHTH AVENUE SUNDAY SCHOOL.

The Standing Committee of the Eighth Avenue Sunday school gratefully acknowledges the receipt of the following donations since their last publication, viz.—

Cash, from a lady, $15; Henry I Seaman, Esq, $5; Miss T K, $5; Henry Youngs, Esq, $5; Daniel Oakley, Esq. $5; cash, from one person, $4; Mrs G Lee, $3; Timothy Whittemore, Esq, $2; Charles N S Rowland, Esq, $2; cash from two persons, $4; Mrs Swan, $2; Mrs J Jay, $1; M A Webb, $1; Mrs Maxwell, $1; Mrs Weed, $1; Mr Phillips, $1; Mr G Rapelye, $1; E A Clark, $1; Mrs Isaac Jones, $1; Mrs John Cox, $1; A E H, $1; T N Stanford, Esq, $1; E Y H, $1; Miss Myers, $1; Mrs Hinton, $1; cash from seven persons, $8 25; Mrs Howes, 50 cents; Mrs Eastnor, 50 cents; Dr Belcher, 50 cents; Mr Bogart, 50 cents; a lady, 50 cents; Mr Yeliab, 50 cents; Mrs J R B, 50 cents; J M K, 50 cents; J A, 50 cents; J A Bleecker, 50 cents; Mrs Stewart, 50 cents; Mrs H Young, 50 cents; a lady, 50 cents; M E, 50 cents; a lady, 50 cents; Miss H E Thomas, 50 cents; a lady, 50 cents; cash from twenty-two persons, $11 25; Mrs Kersey, 25 cents; Mrs Warner, 25 cents; three ladies, 87 cents; cash from eighteen persons, $4 61. Total amount, 99 98.

There is still a small balance yet remaining against the school, for which they have to depend upon the contributions of their Episcopal friends to cancel. All donations will be gratefully received by the Protestant Episcopal Press, 142 Fulton-street; Swords, Stanford & Co., 152 Broadway; Prot. Epis. Sunday School Union, 28 Ann street; or by the treasurer, Reuben Spencer, 100 Twentieth-street.

PRESS DEPOSITORY.

No. 142 FULTON-ST.

Letters have been received at the N. Y. Protestant Episcopal Press, up to February 28, from the following persons, viz.

Rev L A Barrow, with remit; Rev C Wallace; Wm Clapp; Postmaster, Wilink, P C; Postmaster, Columbia, S C; S C Ward, with remit; A Wakelee; S J Beebee; Postmaster, Grahamsville, S C; William Sands; Rev Thomas Meachem, with remit; Rev William Sheldon; J Van Rensselaer, with remit; Rev John Burke; Rev T B Fairchild, with remit; Mr Charles Stimpson, jun; Postmaster, Madison, Va; Postmaster, Cheraw, S C; E Milligan; Marsh, Capen & Lyon, 1; Rev A A Muller, with remit; George & James Robinson; George & Jas Robinson; Rev J T Wheat; G & J Robinson; William Marshal & Co; Joseph Whetham; Hooker & Claxton; S Babcock; Charles D Carpe, with remit; S Babcock; Hooker & Claxton; Weeks, Jordan Co; Rev Nathan Stem; Marsh, Capen & Lyon, 2; Hooker & Claxton.

Packages forwarded by the Protestant Episcopal Press.

Rev John Claxton, Leonardtown, Md, left at 36 Reed street; Rev S C Kerr, care of J R Magruder, Baltimore, per schooner Amanda; Rev David Bigler, Philadelphia, per Union line; Charles H Roach, Esq, Ravenswood, L I, per steamboat Comet; George Rowland, Esq, Norfolk, per schooner Virginia, Va; Rev John W Brown, Hallets' Cove, L I, per steamboat Comet.

UNION DEPOSITORY.

28 ANN-STREET.

Letters have been received at the Gen. Prot. Epis. S. S. Union during the week ending February 28, from the following persons, viz.

Rev J V Van Ingen, Greene, N Y, with remit; Rev J C Cochran, Lunenburgh, N S, with remit; Rev S Davis, Hamilton, Ohio, with remit; H Van Rensselaer, Ogdensburgh, N Y, with remit; D Dubois, Norway, N Y, with remit; Rev Dr Reed, Poughkeepsie; Rev Asa Eaton, D D, Burlington, N J; Messrs Hooker & Claxton, Philadelphia; Miss C B Watlington, St Croix, with remit.

Packages forwarded by the Episc. S. S. Union, during the week ending February 28.

Joseph Gill, Richmond, Va, 1 package, per schooner Lynchburgh; Miss C B Watlington, St Croix, one package, per brig E Pluribus Unum; Rev A A Muller, D D, Clarksville, Tenn, 1 package, sent to 142 Fulton street.

IN the Press, and will be published in the course of the ensuing week by LOUIS SHERMAN, 142 Fulton-street, MISSIONARY FANATICISM OPPOSED TO CHRISTIAN ZEAL, a discourse delivered in St. John's Church Brooklyn. The profits of the publication to be added to the collection made at its delivery, for Bishop Chase's College, in Illinois. March 2.

CHURCH FOR SALE. The property of the Protestant Episcopal Church of St. Timothy, in Sixth street, is to be sold by the Sheriff, at the Merchants' Exchange, on Monday, March 4, at one o'clock, P. M.

For further particulars see Courier and Enquirer of Monday, under "Sheriff's sales."
February 27, 1889. 1t.

GEMS FROM THE [illegible] Lord's Prayer, twelve copperplate engravings; by the Rev. R. C. Shimeall, Rector of the Church of the Messiah, New York.

Music of the Church, 6th edition, by Dr. Wainwright.

The Christian Keepsake, Edited by the Rev John A. Clark, with splendid engravings.

The Churchman's Annual, Edited by the Rev. John W. Brown, containing a memoir of Jacob Lorillard, Esq.

The Churchman's Almanac, for 1839.

The Religious Souvenir, Edited by Mrs. L. H. Sigourney.

The above works just published and for sale, at 142 Fulton street, by LOUIS SHERMAN.
Feb. 19. tf

NOTICE.—The Co-partnership heretofore existing between SHERMAN & TREVETT, is this day dissolved by mutual consent. The affairs of the co-partnership will be settled by Louis Sherman, 142 Fulton st., where all persons indebted to the firm are requested to make immediate payment. LOUIS SHERMAN,
New York, Feb. 19, 1839. BENJ. G. TREVETT.

CARD.—LOUIS SHERMAN, (of the late firm of Sherman & Trevett,) will conduct the business of Publishing and Bookselling, at the same place. The patronage of his former friends, he trusts, will be continued with the same liberality as heretofore. f20m

WORKS BY THE REV. S. T. BLOOMFIELD, D. D., F. S. A., dedicated to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, third edition, greatly enlarged and very considerably improved, of the GREEK TESTAMENT, with copious English notes, critical, philological, and explanatory; in two very large and closely printed volumes, 8vo., £2, handsomely bound in cloth lettered.

"Dr. Bloomfield's edition of the Greek Testament will be invaluable to all those whose profession requires, or whose leisure admits of a critical study of the sacred writings. Dr. Bloomfield has deserved well both of the Church and of the Christian world, and has fairly earned the highest remuneration which the dispensers of ecclesiastical patronage have to bestow."—*Ec. Rev.*

"Much as had been done in the two preceding impressions, the THIRD edition is yet further enlarged, and very materially improved. In addition to his own researches Dr. Bloomfield has availed himself of various suggestions for the improvement of his work, which in its present state exhibits the result of the labors of all preceding critical editors of the New Testament, as well as of his own researches for more than thirty years. Upon the whole, without depreciating the merit of the labors of preceding editors, this third edition may justly be regarded as the most valuable for biblical students that has yet been issued from the press in this country."
Rev T. Hartwell Horne's Introduction. 9th edit 1839.

COLLEGE AND SCHOOL GREEK TESTAMENT, with English notes. Second edition, with additions, and a new Map of Palestine, adapted to the Gospel history. One thick volume, 12mo, 10*s.* 6*d.* cloth, gilt lettered.

"This edition of the Greek Testament supplies a desideratum in scholastic literature. The notes, (which are strictly grammatical, scholastic, and elementary,) furnish to the juvenile student every requisite aid for the correct interpretation of the New Testament."
Christian Remembrancer.

"It is impossible to say how far the public are indebted to Dr. Bloomfield for these labors of his industrious pen; they will carry down his name with the highest honor to posterity. Our prayer is, that his invaluable life may long be spared, and that he may be permitted to reap the full reward of his self-sacrificing devotion to the imperishable interests of biblical science."—*Evangelical Mag.*

THE HISTORY OF THE PELOPONNESIAN WAR, by THUCYDIDES, newly translated into English, and accompanied with very copious notes, philological and explanatory, historical and geographical; with maps and plates. 3 vols. 8vo., £2 5*s.*

"In the notes by this translator, numerous interesting points of classical antiquities are ably discussed, and *many thousands* of invaluable illustrations of the obscure passages of the author are adduced from the best Greek writers of every age. As to the version, considering the all but insuperable difficulties with which the translator has had to contend, in a writer said by some great scholars to be *untranslatable*, we can with truth say that he has executed his task with fidelity, taste, and judgment. Upon the whole, we can pronounce the work to be quite indispensable to all who would hope to understand the text of the *greatest* of *historians*, but most obscure of writers."—*Gentleman's Magazine.*

THUCYDIDES. New Recension of the text, with copious English notes, critical, philological, and explanatory; Examination Questions, &c, for the use of Colleges and Public Schools. 3 vols. post 8vo, 27*s.* bds.

"We feel confident that no reader of Thucydides will fail to purchase an edition where, be their scholarship what it may, they cannot rise from its perusal without having learnt much that they did not know before, and which they cannot obtain elsewhere. . . . . We will not do the tutors of colleges, and masters of public schools the injustice to believe, that they are so regardless of their own reputation and their pupils' improvement, as not to adopt the only edition of Thucydides, which this or any other country has produced, really suited for the instruction of young persons."—*Gen. Mag.*

"Thucydidis Historia Græce, a doctissimo Britanno ternis voluminibus elegantissime edita."—*Prof. Poppo of Frankfort, in the preface to his noble Variorum Edition of Thucydides; ten vols. 8vo.*

The above works for sale at the Bookstore of Messrs. Wiley & Putnam, 161 Broadway. 3t.

YONKERS FEMALE SEMINARY.—This institution is situated on the bank of the Hudson river, a quarter of a mile north of the village of Yonkers, Westchester county, N. Y., and is under the charge of Mr. and Mrs. Bleecker, late of the Franklin Academy, Sing-sing.

Its healthy situation, commanding prospect, pleasant retired walks extending over many acres shaded by forest trees, and its easy access from the city, being only seventeen miles distant, recommend this location to public patronage.

The Summer Term commences on the first of May, and the Winter Term on the first of November, each of which is succeeded by a vacation of four weeks.

Application for admission of pupils may be made by mail, addressed to the subscriber, at the Seminary. Circulars may be obtained from Mr. Tho. N. Stanford, of the firm of Swords & Co., Broadway; Mr. George Brinckerhoff, at the office of the New York Times, 45 William street, or at the bookstore of Mr. R. Carter, corner of Canal and Mercer streets.

GEO. W. BLEECKER, Principal.

References,—Lemuel Wells, Esq. Rev. A. H. Crosby, Rev. Thomas Birch, Messrs. Samuel Thompson and William L. Morris, Yonkers. Messrs. William Nelson and Isaac Seymour, Peekskill. Messrs. Leonard Bleecker and Edward Kemeys, Singsing. Rev. William Berrian, S. H. Cone, J. F. Schroeder, Messrs. James Bleecker & Co, Thomas N. Stanford, J. D. Stevenson, and the Editors of the "New York Express," New York. Mr. James Patten, jun. Philadelphia. Rev. B. F. Welsh, Albany. Rev. B. M. Hill, Troy. Rev. John Dowling, Providence R. I. Mr. E. L. Lockwood, Cincinnati, O. Mr. Jonathan Tucker, Mobile, Ala. Francis Ilsley, jun. Esq. of the house of Reynolds, Byrnes & Co. Messrs. Thomas Magoffin and J. B. Byrne, New Orleans. Messrs. Robert Dunbar, Wm. St. John Elliot, L. R. Marshall, Natchez.

Feb. 10. 3m.

A DICTIONARY OF THE CHURCH, by the Rev. WILLIAM STAUNTON, just published by LOUIS SHERMAN, 142 Fulton-street. For the opinion entertained of this work reference is made to the editorial columns of the Churchman, New York American, New York Gazette, and New Yorker.

Also *Keith's Demonstrations of the Truth of Christianity.* From the second Edinburgh edition.

PARISH AND RELIGIOUS LIBRARY.—*Of thirteen volumes. Contents as follows:*

Vol. I. contains Leslie on Deism; West on the Resurrection; with a general and special preface, biographical memoirs, and notes

Vol. II. contains Bishop Sumner on Apostolical Preaching and on Ministerial Duty, with preface and notes.

Vol. III. contains the Apology for the Church of England, and a Treatise of the Holy Scriptures. By Bishop Jewell; with a preface, biographical memoirs, and notes.

Vol. IV. contains A Translation of the Epistles of Clement of Rome, Polycarp, and Ignatius, and of the First Apology of Justin Martyr; with introduction, and brief notes illustrative of the ecclesiastical history of the first two centuries. By the Rev. Temple Chevallier, B. D., late fellow and tutor of Catharine Hall, Cambridge, England.

Vol. V. contains Bishop Gibson's Three Pastoral Letters, Horne's Letters on Infidelity, and to Adam Smith; with prefaces, biographical memoirs and notes.

Vol. VI. contains A Practical Discourse concerning a Future Judgment. By William Sherlock, D. D.

Vol. VII. contains A Practical Exposition of the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark, in the form of lectures, intended to assist the practice of domestic instruction and devotion. By John Bird Sumner, D. D., Bishop of Chester, England.

Vols. VIII. and IX. contain The Apostolic Origin of Episcopacy, asserted in a series of letters addressed to the Rev. Dr Miller, one of the pastors of the United Presbyterian churches in the city of New York, A. D. 1808. By the Rev. John Bowden, D. D. Professor of Moral Philosophy, Logic, and Belles-lettres in Columbia College. *Audi alteram partem*; with a preface, by the Rt. Rev. B. T. Onderdonk, D. D.

Vol. X. contains Piety Without Asceticism, or the Protestant Kempis; A Manual of Christian Faith and Practice, selected from the writings of Scougal, Charles, Howe, and Cudworth; with corrections and occasional notes. By John Jebb, D. D., F. R. S., Bishop of Limerick, Ardfert, and Aghadoe.

Vol. XI. contains the Lives of Dr John Donne, Sir Henry Wotton, Mr. Richard Hooker, Mr. George Herbert and Dr. Robert Sanderson. By Isaac Walton, with a life of the author, by Thomas Zouch, M. A.; and notes selected from those of Dr. Zouch. These were honorable men in their generations. Eccles. xliv. 7.

Vol. XII. contains A Practical Exposition of the Gospel of St. Luke, in the form of lectures, intended to assist the practice of domestic instruction and devotion. By John Bird Sumner, D D., Bishop of Chester, author of "A Practical Exposition of the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark."

Vol. XIII. contains Lives, Characters, and Address to Posterity. By Gilbert Burnet, D. D., Lord Bishop of Sarum; with the two prefaces to the Dublin editions.—Edited, with an introduction and notes, by John Jebb, D. D., F. R. S., Bishop of Limerick, Ardfert, and Aghadoe.

The above Library is kept constantly on hand and for sale by the Protestant Episcopal Press, 142 Fulton street.

THE ETON LATIN GRAMMAR.—In the press, and will be published by Louis Sherman, 142 Fulton street, on or about the 1st of March next, "The [illegible] nouns, the preterperfect tenses of the verbs, syntax and prosody given in English; together with rules for construing and a short system of Rhetoric, First American edition. Edited by the Rev. James Coghlan, A. B., Queens College, Cambridge (England,) and Rector of St. Paul's church, Flatbush L. I., New York.

"Nullum munus Reipublicæ afferre majus meliusve possumus, quam si doceamus atque erudiamus juventutem"—*Cicero.*

The reputation of the little work now offered to the American public, as a book most admirably calculated to initiate the student in the elements of Latin Grammar has long been established in England. That it is the Grammar used in the first classical institution of Great Britain may of itself be considered a recommendation to the unprejudiced teacher, and when to this it is added what is well known to be the case, that, with very few exceptions, *it is the Grammar used all over England* wherever the classics are taught, it would seem needless to say more, in order to claim for it the notice and serious attention of those gentlemen who are engaged in the important duty of educating the youth of the country.

If the attention of the public be once fairly attracted to this elementary work, there is no doubt that it will be receive a large share of their patronage, for its merits as a school book, are unquestionable; since they have long been attested by the seal of approbation from multitudes of scholars by whom it has been adopted.

PRIVATE TUITION.—The subscriber now confines his teaching exclusively to families, and having two hours at present unoccupied, will attend to any who may wish instruction in the usual branches of education preparatory to entering college. JAMES J. ACHESON, A. M.

A note addressed to No. 3 Charlton street, will meet with attention, or Mr. A. may be seen in the evening from 7 to 9 o'clock. 4t*

TROY FEMALE SEMINARY, *Troy, Rensselaer County, New York.*—MRS. EMMA WILLARD YATES, (late Mrs. Emma Willard,) having retired from the superintendence of the Troy Female Seminary, the Trustees have appointed her son, MR. JOHN H. WILLARD, and her daughter-in-law, MRS. SARAH L. WILLARD, to be joint Principals. The Trustees have entire confidence in them both, and in their opinion, the management of the institution could not be entrusted to better hands. There will be no change in the system of instruction which has heretofore been pursued, and which has been so eminently successful.

MRS. SARAH L. WILLARD, on whom the care of the pupils and the superintendence of their instruction will of course devolve, has been an inmate of the Seminary from her childhood; she was educated under the care of the former Principal, has been a teacher in the Seminary for twelve years, and for the last eight years its Vice Principal. To the former patrons of the institution *she is sufficiently known, and does not require the commendation of the Trustees; she is assisted by seventeen* teachers—the same individuals who have heretofore so ably filled the several departments of instruction.

Within the last year a valuable chemical and philosophical apparatus has been procured for the institution, in part from funds furnished by the State, and in part by the liberality of the late Principal, and a building owned by the Trustees, contiguous to the principal Seminary buildings, has been fitted up expressly for the lectures in these departments. The Trustees feeling perfect confidence in the present organization of the Seminary, and believing that its elevated character will be fully sustained, take pleasure in commending it to the public as every way worthy of their continued patronage and support.

Troy, December 4, 1838

Joseph Russell, Richard P. Hart, James Van Schoonhoven, Thomas Clowes, Robert D. Silliman, John D Willard, John P. Cushman, Griffith P. Griffith, Jonas C. Heartt, Stephen Warren, George B. Warren, Henry W. Strong, James Wallace, Leroy Mowry, John Paine, *Trustees.*

CONDITIONS OF ADMITTANCE.

Boarders $240 per annum, or $120 per term; $60 payable in advance. If extra branches are pursued, the advance required will be $75. For this sum the pupil is entitled to board, and all necessaries connected with *it*; such as room-rent, lodging, washing, fuel, light, &c., and to tuition in any or all of the branches constituting the extensive course of English studies here pursued. Extra charges are made for Music on the *Piano*, $15 per quarter; use of the Piano, $2; Music on the Harp, $20; use of the Harp, $4; singing lessons, $11 per quarter; Music on the Guitar, $10; use of the Guitar, $1; the French Language, $7 50; the Italian Language, $8; the Latin Language, $4; Dancing, $6; Drawing and Painting, $7; use of Patterns, $1; Oil Painting, $10; Botany, $3 per term. Lectures on Natural Philosophy and Chemistry, $5 per course. Interest charged where payments are not punctually made.

Books and Stationary furnished on reasonable terms; or if parents prefer a stipulated sum for stationary, the charges will be $5 per term.

The school year, exclusive of vacations, consists of forty-four weeks; a term, of half the school year or twenty-two weeks; a quarter, of one-fourth or eleven weeks. The first term will commence on the third Wednesday of September, and continue twenty-two weeks, when, after a vacation of two weeks, the second term will commence, and continue twenty-two weeks. There will then be a vacation of six weeks.

Boarders can, if they choose, remain at the Seminary, and be instructed during vacations. A charge of $3 50 per week will be made for board and tuition in the English studies. Jan. 19, 6w.

THE OFFICE OF THE JUDGE PROMOTED BY BREEKS AGAINST WOOLFREY.

Arches Court, Dec. 1, 1838.

Sir H. Jenner gave sentence in this case, which was argued on the 19th of November. The learned judge began by observing, that it was due to the arguments which had been addressed to the court by the learned counsel who had argued the case on either side, that he should have taken time to consider of his judgment, and also to look into the authorities which had been cited; he had been ready to give his judgment on the by-day of the term, but the counsel having been engaged before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and it being unusual to deliver the judgment of the court in such cases in the absence of counsel, he had fixed this as an additional court-day for the purpose. It unfortunately happened, however, that counsel were absent from the same cause this day likewise; but it would be inconvenient to the parties to postpone his judgment longer. It was a cause of office promoted by the Rev. George Breeks, vicar of the parish of Carisbrooke, in the Diocese of Winchester, against Mary Woolfrey, of the same parish, widow, citing her to answer to certain articles addressed to her "for her soul's health, and for the lawful correction of her manners and excesses," which is the usual language of citations, and more especially for having unduly and illegally erected, or caused to be erected, a certain tombstone in the churchyard of the said parish to the memory of Joseph Woolfrey, late of the parish, deceased, with a certain inscription thereon, contrary to the articles, canons, and constitutions, or to the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England. The cause was brought by letters of request from the Diocese of Winchester (this court having no original jurisdiction,) the chancellor of that diocese having consented to refer the matter to this court, which he had a right to do; this court, therefore, had no alternative but to accept the letters of request; for it was not contended—nay, it was admitted, that if the inscription was of the character attributed to it in the citation, no person had a right to erect a tombstone with an inscription impugning the doctrines and discipline of the Church of England, and that a person so offending was liable to be punished, and the tombstone to be removed. The question then was, whether the inscription had been properly described in the citation, and the additional offence laid in the articles, that it was erected without leave of the incumbent, did not appear on the face of the citation. The question, therefore, was confined to the legality of the inscription. The inscription set forth in the articles was, "Pray for the soul of Joseph Woolfrey," and "It is a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead." 2 Maccab. xii. 46. Now, from the nature of the case, which was a criminal proceeding, the burden of proof was on the party setting up the illegality of the inscription. The minister of the parish was the proper party to proceed, if the inscription was of the character described, for he was bound to remove what was a scandal to the parishioners resorting to the parish church and contrary to the rites and ceremonies of the Church of England as by law established. To the incumbent belonged the superintendence of the church and churchyard, and it was his duty to take care that no inscription should be placed there which could be made the means of disseminating doctrines inconsistent with those of the Established religion. The articles purported to state the law and the facts to which the law was to be applied. The first article alleged that, by the 22d article of the Church of England, it was declared that the Romish doctrine concerning purgatory, pardon, and other things therein mentioned, is "a fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the word of God." It then went on to state, that the defendant, notwithstanding, did erect a tomb or headstone, in the churchyard of Carisbrooke, to the memory of her husband, on which were the before-mentioned inscriptions, both of which, it is alleged, are contrary to the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England, and to the articles, canons, and constitutions thereof; that notice had been given to Mrs. Woolfrey to remove the stone, and that she had refused or neglected to do so, and that the same still remains; and the last article concludes with praying that she may be peremptorily monished to remove the stone, and be canonically corrected and punished, and condemned in the costs. The law then principally relied on is the 22d article of 1562; for although there is a general reference to the other articles, canons, and constitutions of the Church, the canon principally relied on is the 22d. In the argument in support of the articles against the defendant, it was urged that the 22d article, in declaring the Romish doctrine of purgatory to be repugnant to the word of God, did in effect declare, that the offering of prayers for the dead was also opposed to the word of God, as constituting part of the doctrine of purgatory; for that the two were so intimately blended together, that it was impossible to separate the one from the other; consequently, an inscription inviting passers-by to pray for the soul of Joseph Woolfrey, and containing the passage from the Maccabees, was an illegal inscription. It appeared to him that the point upon which the whole question turned was, whether praying for the dead was so necessarily connected with the Romish doctrine of purgatory as to form a part of it. It was no doubt true, that the doctrine of purgatory included the practice of praying for the dead, but it did not necessarily follow that the converse of the proposition was true—that is, that prayers for the dead necessarily constituted a part of the doctrine of purgatory as held by the Romish Church. If that fact could be made out, there would be an end of the case. Many authorities had been cited in support of the different views of the counsel in the cause, and to some of them it would be necessary for the court to advert. The counsel had very properly abstained from the theological part of the question; and it would not be proper for the court to take upon itself the duty of inquiring whether the doctrine of purgatory, as received by the Romish Church, was or was not supported by any warranty of Scripture. The law, that is, the 22d canon, had expressly stated, that it was "grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the word of God;" and by this law he was bound to govern himself. The question, then, shortly was this—is praying for the dead involved in the doctrine of purgatory? and with a view to deciding that question, the first thing to determine was, what is the doctrine of purgatory as received in the Romish Church? As far as he had been able to learn, it did not appear that there had been any declaration of the doctrine of purgatory by any general council till that of Florence, in 1438, which contained the first allusion to the doctrine. This was afterwards followed up by the Council of Trent in 1563. It would appear, according to the best authorities to which the court had access, that the notion of purgatory was first introduced about the fifth or sixth century. Bishop Tontine, in vol. 2 of his Elements of Christian Theology, states, that "the practice of praying for the dead began in the third century; but it was not till long afterward that purgatory was even mentioned among Christians. It was at first doubtfully received, and was not fully established until the Papacy of Gregory the Great, in the beginning of the seventh century." The doctrine then introduced, and which is declared by the 22d article of our Church to be repugnant to the word of God, is described in the Catechism of Trent:—"Purgatory is a fire, in which the souls of the pious are purged by torment for a definite period, that an entrance may be opened for them to an eternal home, into which nothing polluted can enter." It was also a part of the doctrine that the pains of purgatory may be alleviated or shortened by the prayers of the living, by masses, and by thanksgivings. This doctrine being declared by the Church of England to be without warranty of Scripture, the question was, whether prayer for the dead fell under the same condemnation. Now, the first argument that suggested itself against this supposition is, that prayer for the dead is a practice of a much earlier date than the introduction of the doctrine of purgatory, for it clearly appears that the doctrine of prayer for the dead prevailed amongst the early, if not the earliest Christians, who had no notion of the doctrine of purgatory at that day. The object of prayers for the departed, offered by those who profess the Romish religion, is to relieve them from the pains of purgatory; but the object of the primitive Christians in their prayers for the dead was, that they might have rest and quiet in the interval between death and the resurrection, and that at the last day they might receive the perfect consummation of bliss. The learned judge here cited the following passage from Bishop Taylor's Dissuasive from Popery, vol. x: "There are two great causes of their mistaken pretensions in this article from antiquity. The first is, that the ancient churches in their offices, and the fathers in their writings, did teach and practice respectively prayers for the dead. Now, because the Church of Rome does so too, and more than so—relates her prayers to the doctrine of purgatory, and for the souls there detained—her doctors vainly suppose that whenever the holy fathers speak of prayer for the dead, they conclude for purgatory; which vain conjecture is as false as it is unreasonable; for it is true the fathers did pray for the dead—but how? 'That God should show them mercy, and hasten the resurrection, and give a blessed sentence in the great day.' But then it is also to be remembered, that they made prayers and offered for those, who by the confession of all sides, never were in purgatory, even for the patriarchs and prophets, for the apostles and evangelists, for martyrs and confessors, and especially for the blessed Virgin Mary." And he cites authorities, Epiphanius, St. Cyril, and others. "Upon what account," he adds, "the fathers did pray for the saints departed, and indeed generally for all, it is not now seasonable to discourse; but to say this only, that such general prayers for the dead as those above reckoned, the Church of England never did condemn by any express article, but left it in the middle. But," he adds, "she expressly condemns the doctrine of purgatory, and consequently all prayers for the dead relating to it." And in the 11th vol. (page 58) he shows that though the ancient fathers of the Church did sanction prayers for the dead, they did not even know the Romish doctrine of purgatory. Again, Archbishop Usher says, "Our Romanists do commonly take it for granted that purgatory and prayer for the dead be so closely linked together, that the one doth necessarily follow the other; but in so doing they greatly mistake the matter, for howsoever they may deal with their own devices as they please, and link their prayers with their purgatory as closely as they list, yet shall they never be able to show that the commemoration and prayers for the dead used by the ancient Church had any relation with their purgatory." Without reference to any other authorities which were numerous on this point, it was clear that long before there was any notion of the doctrine of purgatory prayers for the dead were offered by the primitive Church. But it had been said that whatever might be the case in the early ages, the Church of England had taken a different view of the subject; and with reference to what had taken place in the earliest time of the Reformation, and subsequently, that though prayers for the dead were not considered in the first instance contrary to the principles of the Christian religion in later ages, they had been considered as opposed to the principles and doctrines of the Church, which had been shown by the alterations made at different times in its liturgy. The learned judge then referred to the alterations made in the Book of Common Prayer in the reign of Edward VI. It was true that the Prayer-book compiled for the public use of the Church was prepared by persons of great eminence and learning, called together by the king to consider the alterations necessary to be made in the public service of the Church, in consequence of the progress of the reformation of the Established religion. It was not immaterial to see the manner in which the first Prayer-book had been compiled, and he could refer to no authority more satisfactory than the Act of Parliament by which the book was established—namely, the 2d and 3d of Edward VI., cap. 1, which was entitled "An Act for the Uniformity of Service and Administration of Sacraments throughout the Realm." The recital set forth that to the intent a uniform, quiet, and godly order should be had, his highness, with advice of his council, had appointed the Archbishop of Canterbury, and certain of the most learned and discreet bishops, and other learned men of this realm, "to consider and ponder as well the premises, and thereupon, having eye and respect to the most sincere and pure Christian religion taught by the Scripture, as well as to the usages in the primitive Church, should draw and make one convenient order, rite, and fashion of common and open prayer and administration of the sacraments to be had and used in his majesty's realm of England and Wales." These, then, were the views with which this book of prayer was directed to be drawn up, "having as well respect to the most sincere and pure Christian religion taught by Scripture, as to the usages in the primitive Church," and they drew up the first Prayer-book of Edward VI. with reference to these principles. Now, in this Prayer-book prayers for the dead were still ordered to be used (though they were in some degree altered from those in the Primer of Henry VIII.) and therefore it must be presumed that the compilers of that Prayer-book did not consider that such prayers were necessarily connected with the doctrine of purgatory. This first Prayer-book of Edward VI. was afterwards revised, and some parts of it with reference to the Communion Service and the Burial Service were omitted, and amongst the passages omitted were those which related to prayers for the dead; and it had been argued from this omission, that the persons who were employed to revise the first Prayer-book of Edward VI. did not consider these prayers as consistent with the doctrines of the Church of England as then established; and that, therefore, if there is no express prohibition of prayers for the dead, by necessary implication the Church of England had decided that they were inconsistent with its doctrines. But what was the principle on which these prayers had been omitted? Various authorities had been referred to in support of the proposition that it was in consequence of a belief that the prayers were inconsistent with the doctrines of the Church of England, and several writers did take that view of the subject. But all agreed that there had been no express prohibition of prayers for the dead; it must therefore to be taken to be by necessary implication that they were prohibited. It appeared, however, from writers and historians, that these alterations in the liturgy in the second Prayer-book of Edward VI., were principally acceded to at the instance of Calvin and Bucer, though he (the learned judge) had not been able to find the precise grounds on which the omissions were made in the writers he had referred to. But he thought that there was one authority at least to show that the surrender of this part of the first Prayer-book was not that, in the opinion of the majority of the persons employed in its revision, they were inconsistent with the doctrines of the Church of England. The Act of Parliament by which the second Prayer-book of Edward VI. was established, the 5th and 6th Edward VI., c. 1., also entitled "An Act for the Uniformity of Service and Administration of Sacraments throughout the realm," in its recital, which must be taken to express the sentiments of the majority of the legislature, stated—"Where (whereas) there hath been a very godly order set forth by the authority of Parliament for common prayer and administration of the sacrament, to be used in the mother tongue within the Church of England, agreeable to the word of God and the primitive Church," adopting the words of the former act, which enjoined "a regard to the religion taught by Scripture, and to the usages in the primitive Church;" very comfortable to all good people desiring to live in Christian conversation, and most profitable to the estates of the realm, upon the which the mercy, favor, and blessing of Almighty God are in nowise so readily and plenteously poured as by common prayers, due using of the sacraments, and preaching of the Gospel with the devotion of the hearers." And it goes on to state, that yet, "notwithstanding a great number of people do wilfully abstain and refuse to come to their parish churches, and other places where common prayer, the administration of the sacraments, and preaching of the word of God is used:" and in the fifth section it sets forth, "And because there hath arisen in the use and exercise of the aforesaid common service in the Church heretofore set forth divers doubts for the fashion and manner of the ministration of the same, rather by the curiosity of the ministers and mistakers than of any other worthy cause; therefore, as well for the more plain and manifest explanation thereof, as for the more perfection of the said order of common service, in some places where it is necessary to make the same prayers and fashion of service more earnest and fit to stir Christian people to the true honoring of Almighty God;" and it goes on to set forth that the king and Parliament had caused the Book of Common Prayer "to be faithfully and godly perused, explained, and made fully perfect." This act had been repealed by the 1st of Mary, which was itself repealed by the 1st of Elizabeth, c. 2, which restored the 5th and 6th of Edward VI. Now, up to this period of time, it seemed that at least there was not any express prohibition of prayers for the dead, nor any notion that they implied a necessary belief in the doctrine of purgatory, though, in consequence of professors of the Romish religion taking advantage of the practice as an argument to support their own doctrine of purgatory, it was thought proper that the form of prayer should be altered, and those prayers omitted in the public service of the Church, as not being enjoined (which is admitted) or sanctioned by any warranty of Scripture. It seemed to him that all the authorities went no further than this—to show that the Church discouraged prayers for the dead, but did not prohibit them; and that the 22d article is not violated by the use of such prayers. The ground on which the Church consented to the omission of these prayers could not perhaps be better stated than by Mr. Palmer in his Origines Liturgicæ, to this effect: "When the custom of praying for the dead began in the Christian Church has never been ascertained. We find traces of the practice in the second century, and either then, or shortly after, it appears to have been customary in all parts of the Church. The first person who objected to such prayer was Aerius, who lived in the fourth century; but his arguments were answered by various writers, and did not produce any effect in altering the immemorial practice of praying for those that rest. Accordingly, from that time, all the liturgies in the world contained such prayers. Some persons will perhaps say that this sort of prayer is unscriptural; that it infers either the Romish doctrine of purgatory, or something else which is contrary to the will of God or the nature of things. But when we reflect that the great divines of the English Church have not taken this ground, and that the Church of England herself has never formally condemned prayers for the dead, but only omitted them in her liturgy, we may, perhaps, think that there are some other reasons to justify that omission." And then this learned writer proceeded to state the probable reason of the omission of these prayers in the liturgy of the English Church—namely, that they might be abused to the prejudice of the uneducated classes, to the support of the Roman Catholic doctrine of purgatory. He (the learned judge) was therefore of opinion that in this case there had been no violation of the 22d article of the Church, so as to call for punishment by ecclesiastical censure. The 22d article did not prohibit prayers for the dead, unless so far as they necessarily involved the doctrine of purgatory, and he considered the inscription had not been shown to be a violation of that article. But it was said that other articles of the Church had been violated, and reference had been make to the 35th article, which was to this effect: 'That the Second Book of Homilies contained "a godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessary for these times, as doth the former Book of Homilies, which were set forth in the time of Edward VI., and therefore we judge them to be read in churches by the ministers diligently and distinctly that they may be understanded of the people." And it had been said that in the 7th homily on prayer, the practice of praying for the dead was declared to be an erroneous doctrine, and therefore as the homilies were directed to be read in churches for the edification of the people, it must be necessarily inferred that they were forbidden and prohibited by the Church of England. Now, if this were clearly so, it would seem somewhat extraordinary that many divines of the Church should, in the face of these articles and of the homilies, have fallen into the error of believing that the Church of England had not prohibited prayers for the dead, but merely discouraged them; but it was still more extraordinary, that considering the violent disputes which had occurred with respect to this point, there had been no express prohibition of the practice in the canons of 1562. If it had been the intention of the Church to have forbidden the practice, surely there would have been an express and distinct prohibition of it. In looking to the homily it must be considered what was the purpose for which it was composed—namely, to discourage the practice of praying for the dead as connected with the doctrine of purgatory; but in no part of the homily was it declared that the practice of praying for the dead is unlawful—merely that it is useless—that prayers for the dead could have no effect in altering the condition of the dead, and that in the word of God we have no commandment so to do; and referring to St. Chrysostom and St. Cyprian, it is said, "Let these and such other places be sufficient to take away the gross error of purgatory out of our heads, neither let us dream any more that the souls of the dead are any thing at all helpen by our prayers." It seemed clearly to have been the intention of the composer of the homily to discourage the practice of praying for the dead; but it did not appear that in any part of the homily he declares the practice to be an unlawful one. But supposing he had been of opinion that such prayers were unlawful, it is not to be necessarily inferred that the Church of England adopted every part of the doctrines contained in the homilies. If it had been the opinion of the framers of the articles and canons of the Church that prayers for the dead were opposed to the Scriptures, they would have expressly declared their illegality, as condemned by the Scriptures and opposed to the doctrines of pure religion. On this part of the case, then, he was of opinion that there had been no violation of any of the articles of the Church. No other articles had been referred to, specifically to make out the proposition that the Church considered prayers for the dead as an illegal practice. But it had been urged in this case, that the person by whom the tombstone had been erected being a Roman Catholic, it must be supposed that the invitation contained in the inscription, to pray for the dead, had a necessary reference to the doctrine of purgatory as received by the Church of which she is a member; and that the inscription must be taken in a Roman Catholic sense, because the quotation from the Maccabees was taken from the Roman Catholic version of the Bible, and not from that authorized by the Church of England. Now he thought this argument not sufficient to authorize him to put any other construction on the inscription than the words would bear, according to their plain meaning. It was true that the version did not agree with the English translation (in fact, in our translation there was not a 46th verse in the xiith chapter of Maccabees;) but the question was not whether the version was correct or not, but whether the meaning was or was not inconsistent with that contained in the English version. Now, it was impossible to read the English version and not see that the sense of the quotation was the same in both; and that the reconciliation spoken of by Judas meant a reconciliation of the dead with a view to the resurrection. Whether the doctrine was taken from the text according to the Romish or English version, the question was, whether it was a violation of the articles, canons, and constitutions of our Church. Was it contrary to Scripture? That was the view he must take of the case, sitting there as an ecclesiastical judge. If any thing arose from the circumstance of the party being a Roman Catholic, or from the sense in which the words of the inscription were understood by the Romish Church, it should have been specifically pleaded; for the court had no judicial information of the existence of a Roman Catholic Bible. He should conclude this part of the case with one observation—what had been the practice of eminent divines of the Church of England? It was correctly stated in the argument that an inscription was placed on the tombstone of Bishop Barrow, in the cathedral of St. Asaph, in 1680, to this effect—"O vos, transeuntes in domum Domini, in domum orationis, orate pro conservo vestro, ut inveniat misericordiam in die Domini." It was not possible to conceive that Bishop Barrow would have suffered such an inscription to be placed upon his tomb, if he had believed that it was contrary to the doctrine and discipline of the Church to which he had belonged. He was then of opinion, on the whole of the case, that the offence imputed by the articles had not been sustained; that no authority or canon had been pointed out by which the practice had been expressly prohibited; and he was accordingly of opinion that, if the articles were proved the facts would not subject the party to ecclesiastical censure, as far as regarded the illegality of the inscription on the tombstone. That part of the articles must therefore be rejected. The other branch of the case was subject to different considerations—namely, the erection of the stone without the consent of the incumbent, which was an ecclesiastical offence. It had been suggested in the argument, that the proceeding on this branch of the case should have been in a civil form, by monition; but it seemed to him that this was the proper form of proceeding; he was not aware of any case in which a different form had been followed. But this offence had not been specified in the decree or citation served on the party. The only ground of illegality on the face of the citation consisted in the inscription; the erecting, or causing to be erected, a monument, without leave of the incumbent, was a distinct and separate offence, which should have been set forth in the citation, in order that the party cited might know what she was called upon to answer. He was clearly of opinion that, according to the law and practice of the court, the citation was insufficient to raise the question whether the consent of the incumbent had been obtained or not; and on this part of the case, likewise, he was of opinion that the articles were inadmissible. The court, therefore, on this view of the case, was bound to reject the articles altogether, and to dismiss the party.

Dr. Blake, on the part of the defendant, applied for the costs.

Sir H. Jenner said, if the costs were pressed, he was not aware that the court had any discretion.

Dr. Blake was instructed to press for costs and

Sir H. Jenner directed that the party should be dismissed with costs.

The queen's advocate wished him to guard himself against misapprehension. He had not stated that the defendant was a Roman Catholic, or implied that there should be one law for one and another for another.

Sir H. Jenner.—No; I only understood you to argue that as the party was a Roman Catholic, the inscription must be taken in a Roman Catholic sense.—*London Record.*

"It greatly behoveth all men when they pray, to consider well and diligently with themselves, what they ask and require at God's hands.

"Now to entreat of that question, whether we ought to pray for them that are departed out of this world or no. Wherein, if we will cleave only unto the word of God, then must we needs grant that we have no commandment so to do. For the Scripture doth acknowledge but two places after this life; the one proper to the elect and blessed of God, the other to the reprobate and damned souls; as may be well gathered by the parable of Lazarus and the rich man, (Luke xvi. 22, 23,) which place St. Augustin expounding, saith in this wise: That which Abraham speaketh unto the rich man in Luke's gospel—namely, that the just cannot go into those places where the wicked are tormented—what other thing doth it signify, but only this, that the just by reason of God's judgment, which may not be revoked, can show no deed of mercy in helping them, which after this life are cast into prison, until they pay the uttermost farthing? These words, as they confound the opinion of helping the dead by prayer, so they do clean confute and take away the vain error of purgatory, which is grounded upon this saying of the gospel, (Matt. v. 26,) 'Thou shalt not depart thence, until thou hast paid the uttermost farthing.' Now doth St. Augustin say, that these men which are cast into prison after this life on that condition, may in no wise be holpen, though we would help them never so much. And why? Because the sentence of God is unchangeable, and cannot be revoked again. Therefore let us not deceive ourselves, thinking that either we may help other, or other may help us by their good and charitable prayers in time to come. For, as the Preacher saith, (Eccles. xi. 3,) 'When the tree falleth, whether it be toward the south or toward the north, in what place soever the tree falleth, there it lieth;' meaning thereby that every mortal man dieth either in a state of salvation or damnation, according as the words of the Evangelist John do also plainly import, saying (John iii. 36) 'He that believeth on the Son of God hath eternal life; but he that believeth not on the Son shall never see life, but the wrath of God abideth upon him.' Where is then the third place which they call purgatory? Or where shall our prayers help and profit the dead? St. Augustin doth only acknowledge two places after this life, heaven and hell. As for the third place, he doth plainly deny that there is any such to be found in all Scripture. Chrysostom likewise is of this mind, that unless we wash away our sins in the present world, we shall find no comfort afterward. And St. Cyprian saith, that after death repentance and sorrow of pain shall be without fruit; weeping also shall be in vain, and prayer shall be to no purpose. Therefore he counselleth all men to make provision for themselves while they may, because when they are once departed out of this life, there is no place for repentance, nor yet for satisfaction.

"Let these and such other places be sufficient to take away the gross error of purgatory out of our heads; neither let us dream any more that the souls of the dead or any thing at all holpen by our prayers, but as the Scripture teacheth us, let us think that the soul of man passing out of the body goeth straightways either to heaven, or else to hell; whereof the one needeth no prayer, and the other is without redemption.

"The only purgatory, wherein we must trust to be saved, is the death and blood of Christ; which if we apprehend with a true and steadfast faith, it purgeth and cleanseth us from all our sins, even as well as if he were now hanging upon the cross. 'The blood of Christ,' saith St. John, (1 John i. 7,) 'hath cleansed us from all sin.' 'The blood of Christ,' saith St. Paul, (Heb. ix. 14,) 'hath purged our consciences from dead works to serve the living God.' Also in another place he saith, (Heb. x. 10,) 'We be sanctified and made holy by the offering up of the body of Jesus Christ done once for all.' Yea, he addeth more, saying, (verse 14,) 'With the one oblation of his blessed body and precious blood, he hath made perfect for ever and ever all them that are sanctified.' This then is that purgatory wherein all Christian men must put their whole trust and confidence; nothing doubting, but if they truly repent them of their sins, and die in perfect faith, that then they shall forthwith pass from death to life. If this kind of purgation will not serve them, let them never hope to be released by other men's prayers, though they should continue therein unto the world's end. He that cannot be saved by faith in Christ's blood, how shall he look to be delivered by man's intercessions? Hath God more respect to man on earth than he hath to Christ in heaven? 'If any man sin,' saith St. John, (1 John ii. 1, 2,) 'we have an advocate with the Father, even Jesus Christ the righteous, and he is the propitiation for our sins.' But we must take heed that we call upon this Advocate, while we have space given us in this life, lest when we are once dead there be no hope of salvation left unto us. For as every man sleepeth with his own cause, so every man shall rise again with his own cause. And look in what state he dieth, in the same state he shall be also judged, whether it be to salvation or damnation.

"Let us not therefore dream either of purgatory, or of prayer for the souls of them that be dead; but let us earnestly and diligently pray for them which are expressly commanded in holy Scripture, namely, for kings and rulers, for ministers of God's holy word and sacraments, for the saints of this world, otherwise called the faithful; to be short, for all men living, be they never so great enemies to God and his people, as Jews, Turks, Pagans, infidels, heretics, &c. Then shall we truly fulfil the commandment of God in that behalf, and plainly declare ourselves to be the true children of our heavenly Father, who suffereth the sun to shine upon the good and the bad, and the rain to fall upon the just and the unjust. For which, and all other benefits most abundantly bestowed upon mankind from the beginning, let us give him hearty thanks, as we are most bound, and praise his name for ever and ever. Amen."

Homily Concerning Prayer.

From N. Y. American.

DISCOVERY OF ANCIENT RELICS.

It is curious that, at the same time, discoveries by digging should be made on the site of Carthage and near the banks of the Thames. In one case, the result of individual enterprise, in the other the accidental consequence of the construction of a modern railway. We extract the accounts from English papers.

Sir Grenville Temple has employed six months in executing excavations in the neighborhood of the site of Carthage, and his labors have been rewarded by a variety of interesting discoveries. In the ruins of the temple Juno Cœlestus, at Ganath, the protecting divinity of Carthage, he found about 700 coins, different articles of glass, and earthenware utensils. But the most remarkable and unexpected of his discoveries has been that of a villa on the sea shore, and fourteen feet under ground. Eight chambers have been entirely cleared, and their form and decorations prove that the house belonged to some distinguished personage. The walls and the vestibule are paved in superb mosaic, in the same style as those of Pompeii and Herculaneum, and representing a variety of objects, such as marine divinities of both sexes, fishes of different species, marine plants, a vessel with women dancing on the deck, and surrounded by martial admirers, lions, horses, leopards, tigers, zebras, bears, gazelles, herons and other birds. In the different chambers were found several human skeletons, supposed to be the remains of warriors killed during the storming of the villa. In another house Sir Grenville has also discovered various interesting mosaics, representing gladiators combating wild animals in the arena, with the name of each combatant written over his head. In another part are represented horse-races and men breaking in young horses. It is to be hoped that Sir Grenville will publish full particulars of his interesting discoveries.

THE ENGLISH DISCOVERY.

Dr. Allnat published a statement, a few weeks since, of some ancient relics which had been discovered at Pangbourn, Berks, by the laborers employed on the Great Western Railway, and which were supposed to be of Roman origin. This supposition has received within the last few days further confirmation by the exhumation of an almost perfect floor of tesselated pavement, situated in a beautiful valley near the Thames, about two miles from the scene of the former discovery. It is conjectured to have been the floor in the chamber of a Roman villa. The pavement is formed of "quarrels," or the small, irregularly square, detached tesseræ, so characteristic of Greek and Roman manufacture, and the figures are of the most elaborate and beautiful design. The ornamental portion, constituting the centre of the floor, is eight feet square, of four distinct colors, viz. red, gray, brown, and white. The color appears to be formed of a species of fire-hardened cement laid upon the surface of the tesseræ, for it is superficial, and does not pervade its whole structure. The discovery has excited much interest; a great many persons from distant parts of the country, artists and scientific gentlemen, having visited the spot, they are unanimous in declaring the floor to be a beautiful and interesting specimen of ancient art. The site of the house, (or as some imagine it to have been, a military tent,) can be traced with tolerable accuracy by the lines of mortar, charcoal and flint used in the foundation. Two human skeletons were lying exterior to the walls, near one of which a Roman coin was found, and by the side of the other a curious species of broadsword, which antiquarians suppose to be identical with that used by the auxiliary legions. The whole is to be preserved entire.

TRINITY SCHOOL.—76 Varick street.—Rev. Wm Morris, Rector; James Millett, A. M., Latin and Greek languages; ——— Pestiaux, French language. This institution consists of a Classical and an English department. In the former such a course of studies will be pursued as will qualify the pupil for admission into any college in the United States. In the latter instruction will be given in Orthography, Elocution, Arithmetic, Geography, Writing, with the use of the Globes and Maps, Astronomy, Grammar, Rhetoric, History, Algebra, Geometry, Chemistry, Natural Philosophy, and Natural History.

TERMS *per quarter* of twelve weeks.

For the English Department,	$10 00
For the Classical and English Department,	12 50
French, Spanish, Italian, and German, each	5 00
Stationary,	50
Fuel per season,	1 00

Any further information respecting the school can be obtained by application at the school nov3

GENERAL PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL SUNDAY SCHOOL UNION.—Depository No. 28 Ann street, two doors below Nassau street.

Under the superintendence of

JOHN W. MITCHELL, *Chairman.*

Contributions to the funds of the Union to be directed to John W. Mitchell, Treasurer, No. 28 Ann street.

The following books are always to be had at the Depository.

INSTRUCTION AND LIBRARY BOOKS.

REQUISITES.

Sunday School Register; Minute Book; General Class Book; Teacher's Roll Book; Smaller Class Book, stitched in covers; Improved Class Book, do.; Alphabet and Reading Cards; Lord's Prayer, on cards; the Creed Ten Commandments, first table, on cards; second table. do.; Paraphrases on the Collects.

INSTRUCTION BOOKS

System of Instruction; Protestant Episcopal Sunday School Book, No. 1; do. No. 2; do. No. 3; Questions on do. from No 1 to 4; First Truths; Catechism No. 1; do. No. 2; do. No. 3; Lloyd's do.; Manual of Short Prayers; Catechism No. 4, (by Cuming;) Church Catechism; Church Primer; Sunday School Office of Devotion; Sunday School Psalms and Hymns; Companion to the Book of Common Prayer; Questions on the Collects; Harmony of the Creeds Scripture Instruction; Duty to God; Collects from the Prayer-book; Epistles and Gospels from the same; Bible Companion, two vols.; Catechism on the Collects, half bound; Questions on the Gospel of St Matthew; Questions on the Epistles and Gospels, art 1. do. art 2; Questions on the Book of Common Prayer.

THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL SUNDAY SCHOOL LIBRARY.

Published by the Union, bound in uniform style, and consisting of the 18mo works, making 58 volumes, numbered consecutively, at 20 cents per volume, or $11 60 per set. Also,

THE JUVENILE LIBRARY,

Consisting of the 32mo works published by the Union, making 5 volumes, at $1 per set.

NEW YORK PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL PRESS

DEPOSITORY NO. 142 FULTON STREET.

H. COTHEAL, *Treas. and Agent,* 142 *Fulton st.*

BIBLES, PRAYER-BOOKS, DEVOTIONAL AND MISCELLANEOUS WORKS, PUBLISHED AND FOR SALE BY THE PRESS.

Bibles, 8vo and royal 18mo, all bindings.
Testaments, muslin and sheep, various prices.
Prayer-books, 4to, for the desk, 8vo, 12mo,* 18mo, (most common size,) 32mo, (pocket size,) all bindings.
Devotional Sonnets, all bindings.
New Psalms and Hymns, 8vo, 12mo royal 18mo all bindings.
Communicant's Companion (pocket edition,) all bindings.
Life of Bishop Heber, two vols. 8vo.
Parish Library, vols. 1 to 13, boards and calf.
Bishop Sumner's Help to Domestic Instruction and Devotion.
Lectures on St. Matthew and St. Mark, boards and half-calf.
Lectures on St. Luke, do.
Bishop Bloomfield's Manual of Family Prayers, various bindings.
Weller Tracts: vol. i. containing No 1 to 5, vol. ii containing No. 6 to 8.
Sacra Privata, by Bishop Wilson, various bindings

TRACTS.

McEllen Tracts.—1. The McEllen Family.
2. The Baptism.
3. Family in Eternity.
4. The Meeting of the Travellers, all bound in one volume.
History of a Pocket Prayer-book.
A Farmer's account of his Conversion.
Early and Professional Years of Hobart, in 2 vols, 12mo, bound in muslin: by Rev. John McVickar D. D., Professor in Columbia College.

A choice selection of Theological and Church Works, kept constantly on hand and for sale at their Depository.

Tracts.—All the Protestant Episcopal Societies' Tracts, at 15 pp. for one cent.

☞ *All Orders, Remittances, and business communications* should be addressed HENRY COTHEAL, Treas. and agent, 142 Fulton st. sep1

* Adopted at the last general Convention as the standard book.

THE CHURCHMAN

Is printed and published by the New York Protestant Episcopal Press, No. 142 Fulton street, at Three Dollars per annum, in advance.

AGENTS.

Charles Stimpson, jun.	Boston, Mass.
Rev. Charles Burroughs	Portsmouth, N. H.
Sidney Babcock	New Haven, Ct.
S. Barnard	Buffalo, N. Y.
Oliver Steele	Albany, N. Y.
John W. Jones	Louisville, Ky.
Z. Clark	Troy, N. Y.
Arius Nye	Cashier of the Bank of Marietta, Ohio.
Geo. W. Donohue	Philadelphia.
Rev. E. E. Ford	Augusta, Ga.
A. E. Miller	Charleston, S. C.
P. E. Demill, Esq.	Detroit, Michigan.
Armstrong & Berry	Baltimore, Md.
Rev. F. F. Peake	Fayette, Mo.
Messrs. Hotchkiss & Co.	New Orleans.
Rev. Samuel R. Crane	Ohio City, Ohio.
Smith & Crowell	Maumee City, Ohio.
Ruffin Smythe	Randolph, Tenn.
Rev. J. T. Wheat	Nashville, Tenn.
Messrs. Bell & Entwistle	Alexandria, D. C.
Henry H. Hoffman, Post Office Clerk	Quincy, Ill.